

**Calumet-Sag: A National Issue****EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

**HON. BARRATT O'HARA**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 26, 1954

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am calling attention to an editorial in the May 1954 issue of the *Marine News* on the formation of the Cal-Sag Waterways Development Committee, and the vital importance to the Nation of the Calumet-Sag link in the Nation's lakes-to-gulf water transportation system.

On February 17, 1954, when the preliminary steps were being taken in the formation of the Cal-Sag Waterways Development Committee, I said in my re-

marks in the House under a special order:

Mr. Speaker, today there is being held in the city of New Orleans a meeting of dynamic leaders of the Mississippi Valley who vision the opening of new worlds of wealth and opportunity in the development of a great system of inland waterways.

In the immediate start in digging the Calumet-Sag project these men of large interests and long industrial training see, first, the surest means of meeting the economic pains of readjustment; second, multiplying the industries and the employment of inland America while adding to the business volume of the seaports; and third, in the event of war furnishing easily protected facilities for the transportation of men and material.

From this historic gathering in New Orleans eventually came the Cal-Sag Waterways Development Committee, in which men of large stature and of tre-

mendous driving power are uniting their efforts to accomplish the prompt building of the long-needed link to a system of inland waterways so imperative to the prosperity in peace and security in war of our country. The editorial in the *Marine News*, one of the world's leading waterways publications, stresses that Calumet-Sag is not a local issue but a national issue.

With the national interest at stake, and support coming from both parties and all sections of the country, there should be no further delay in appropriating funds for the Calumet-Sag development long since authorized by Congress after exhaustive study and consideration.

The Nation and the times demand Calumet-Sag. Further delay will be inexcusable. The *Marine News* editorial pinpoints the issue.

**SENATE**

TUESDAY, APRIL 27, 1954

(Legislative day of Wednesday, April 14, 1954)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O God, at whose word man goeth forth unto his work and to his labor until the evening, keep within the grasp of Thy firm hand the threads of this day's words and deeds that we may not mar the fair designs of what Thou wouldst do for us and through us. For the beauty which fills the earth, for the love which hallows our homes, for the joy which springs from work well done, we thank Thee, the source of all gladness.

In this moment of devotion, as our spirits bow at this wayside shrine, may it be to us in very truth an altar of Thy grace. If in our frantic seeking for satisfactions and solutions we find all except Thee, the searching experiences of life teach us that we will then have nothing but vanity and spirits that remain still famished and athirst. Make us fit vessels to receive the glory and the good Thou desirest to give to us and through us to all the waste places of this stricken earth. In the Redeemer's name we ask it. Amen.

**THE JOURNAL**

On request of Mr. KNOWLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, April 26, 1954, was dispensed with.

**MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—  
APPROVAL OF JOINT RESOLUTION**

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on April 27, 1954, the President had approved and signed the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 130) requesting the President

to proclaim the week May 2 to May 8, 1954, inclusive, as National Mental Health Week.

**MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE**

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S. 364. An act for the relief of the Advance Seed Co., of Phoenix, Ariz.;

S. 893. An act for the relief of David T. Wright; and

S. 2247. An act to authorize certain members of the Armed Forces to accept and wear decorations of certain foreign nations.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 24) to permit review of decisions of Government contracting officers involving questions of fact arising under Government contracts in cases other than those in which fraud is alleged, and for other purposes, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 2844) to amend the act of December 23, 1944, authorizing certain transactions by disbursing officers of the United States, and for other purposes, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6342) to amend the Public Buildings Act of 1949 to authorize the Administrator of General Services to acquire title to real property and to provide for the construction of certain public buildings thereon by executing purchase contracts; to extend the authority of the Postmaster General to lease quarters for postoffice purposes; and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. DONDERO, Mr. ANGELL, Mr. MCGREGOR, Mr. FALLON, and Mr. TRIMBLE were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills

and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 303. An act to transfer the maintenance and operation of hospital and health facilities for Indians to the Public Health Service, and for other purposes;

H. R. 733. An act for the relief of Hildgard H. Nelson;

H. R. 868. An act for the relief of Cirliaco Catino;

H. R. 944. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Zygmunt Sowinski;

H. R. 1115. An act for the relief of Mrs. Suhula Adata;

H. R. 1370. An act for the relief of Guy H. Davant;

H. R. 1665. An act for the relief of Carl Piowaty and W. J. Piowaty;

H. R. 1673. An act for the relief of James I. Smith;

H. R. 1762. An act for the relief of Sugako Nakai;

H. R. 1768. An act for the relief of Claire Louise Carey and Vincent F. Carey;

H. R. 1788. An act for the relief of Wanda Luceri, also known as Sister Cecilia; Maria De Padova, also known as Sister Rosanna; Anna Santoro, also known as Sister Natalina; Valentina Ruffoni, also known as Sister Severina; Cosima Russo, also known as Sister Carmelina;

H. R. 1912. An act for the relief of Hayik (Jirair) Vartiyani, Annemarie Vartiyani, and Susanig Armenuhi Vartiyani;

H. R. 2010. An act to authorize the sale of certain land in Alaska to the Alaska Evangelization Society, of Levelock, Alaska, for missionary purposes;

H. R. 2024. An act for the relief of Frank L. Peyton;

H. R. 2028. An act for the relief of Mrs. Antonietta Palmieri;

H. R. 2098. An act to provide for the compensation of certain persons whose lands have been flooded and damaged by reason of fluctuations in the water level of the Lake of the Woods;

H. R. 2181. An act for the relief of Richard Karl Hoffman;

H. R. 2403. An act for the relief of Laszlo Varga and Nike Varga;

H. R. 2627. An act for the relief of Cecilia Lucy Boyack;

H. R. 2630. An act for the relief of Balbino Acusin Ariasa;

H. R. 2844. An act providing that the ratification of the Revenue Bond Act of 1935, enacted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, shall apply to all amendments of said act made by said legislature to and including the acts of the 1953 regular session of said legislature, and to all extensions of the period for issuance and delivery of

revenue bonds thereunder, heretofore, or hereafter enacted by said legislature;

H. R. 2849. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the transfer of land from the War Department to the Territory of Hawaii," approved June 19, 1936;

H. R. 2899. An act for the relief of Igor Shwabe;

H. R. 3017. An act for the relief of Felix Petrover;

H. R. 3333. An act for the relief of Julia N. Emmanuel;

H. R. 3624. An act for the relief of Peter M. Leaming;

H. R. 3675. An act for the relief of Herre van der Veen, Mrs. Marie van der Veen, Helen Winifred van der Veen, and Jan Herre van der Veen;

H. R. 3743. An act for the relief of Chaim Szemaja Segal and Icek Hersz Segal;

H. R. 3907. An act for the relief of Jean Sutherland;

H. R. 3951. An act for the relief of Frank G. Koch;

H. R. 4248. An act for the relief of Albertas Eauras;

H. R. 4330. An act for the relief of Dr. Orlando Artuso and family;

H. R. 4474. An act for the relief of Frederick Joseph Buttaccio and others;

H. R. 4638. An act for the relief of David W. Wallace;

H. R. 5185. An act for the relief of Klyce Motors, Inc.;

H. R. 5340. An act for the relief of Tibor, Szuzsa (Susanne), and Judith Sauer;

H. R. 5354. An act for the relief of Liborio Guido Rutillo;

H. R. 5605. An act to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to provide for payment of taxes or payments in lieu of taxes with respect to real property transferred from Government corporations to other agencies of the Federal Government;

H. R. 5684. An act for the relief of Walter Kuznicki;

H. R. 5831. An act to enable the Hawaiian Homes Commission of the Territory of Hawaii to exchange available lands as designated by the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920, and for other publicly owned lands;

H. R. 5986. An act for the relief of Harold E. Wahlberg;

H. R. 6148. An act for the relief of Han Jong Haing;

H. R. 6290. An act to discontinue certain reports now required by law;

H. R. 6786. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to purchase improvements or pay damages for removal of improvements located on public lands of the United States in the Fallsades project area, Fallsades reclamation project, Idaho;

H. R. 7049. An act for the relief of Basil Theodossiou;

H. R. 7140. An act for the relief of Robert A. Duval;

H. R. 7145. An act for the relief of Annelise Catalino;

H. R. 7150. An act for the relief of Thora June Grumbles;

H. R. 7761. An act for the relief of John Lewis Pyles, Jr.; and

H. J. Res. 476. Joint resolution to confer jurisdiction on the Attorney General to determine the eligibility of certain aliens to benefit under section 6 of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953.

#### ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the

following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

H. R. 4869. An act for the relief of Mrs. Bert I. Biedermann (nee Ermenegilda Vittoria Cernecca); and

H. R. 6702. An act to authorize the care and treatment at facilities of the Public Health Service of narcotic addicts committed by the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

On his own request, and by unanimous consent, Mr. LANGER was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate for the remainder of the week.

#### ORDER FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that immediately following the quorum call there may be the customary morning hour for the transaction of routine business, under the usual 2-minute limitation on speeches.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the call of the roll be rescinded.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

##### INVESTMENT OF FUNDS OF INSURANCE COMPANIES IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA IN OBLIGATIONS OF INTERNATIONAL BANK FOR RECONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT

A letter from the Chairman, National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems, Treasury Department, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to permit investment of funds of insurance companies organized within the District of Columbia in obligations of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

##### REPORT ON ADMINISTRATION OF ADVANCE PLANNING PROGRAM

A letter from the Administrator, Housing and Home Finance Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the 17th quarterly report on the administration of the advance planning program, dated December 31, 1953 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Public Works.

##### AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL CIVIL DEFENSE ACT OF 1950, AS AMENDED

A letter from the Administrator, Federal Civil Defense Administration, Washington, D. C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend further the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

#### AUDIT REPORT ON FEDERAL NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSOCIATION AND HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY

A letter from the Comptroller General, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Federal National Mortgage Association and Housing and Home Finance Agency, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1953 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

#### PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Texas; ordered to lie on the table:

##### "Senate Concurrent Resolution 1

"Whereas on April 19, 1920, the United States Supreme Court, in *Missouri v. Holland* (252 U. S. 416), held that notwithstanding the 10th amendment to the Constitution of the United States, a treaty with a foreign power, implemented by an act of Congress subsequently passed for that purpose, authorized the Government of the United States to control and regulate matters which otherwise would be subject to regulation by the States alone; and

"Whereas in its opinion in that case (two distinguished Justices dissenting) it was said: 'Acts of Congress are the supreme law of the land only when made in pursuance of the Constitution, while treaties are declared to be so when made under the authority of the United States. It is open to question whether the authority of the United States means more than the formal acts prescribed to make the convention \* \* \* there may be matters of the sharpest exigency for the national well-being that an act of Congress could not deal with, but that a treaty followed by such an act could. \* \* \* The treaty in question does not contravene any prohibitory words to be found in the Constitution. The only question is whether it is forbidden by some invisible radiation from the general terms of the 10th amendment. \* \* \* We cannot put the case of the State upon higher ground than \* \* \* that, but for the treaty, the State would be free to regulate this subject itself. \* \* \* No doubt the great body of private relations usually falls within the control of the State, but a treaty may override its power.' On these grounds, it was decided 'that the treaty and statute must be upheld'; and

"Whereas the same Court, on February 2, 1942, in the case of *United States v. Pink* (315 U. S. 203), with 2 Justices dissenting and 2 others not participating, held that an executive agreement, made by the President with a foreign power, but not ratified or concurred in by the Senate (as required in case of a treaty by article II of the Constitution), has the same dignity as a treaty made by the President and ratified by the Senate. In consequence, the Court decided that the insurance laws of the State of New York, made for the protection of policyholders and other creditors, were invalidated by the act of the President alone; and

"Whereas, in addition to the treaty and executive agreement referred to in the decisions above mentioned, many others have been made, and still more are proposed, or are in preparation, the effects of which, if made, upon the rights and powers of the States, and the rights of the people, would be disastrous. For examples, reference is made to the Atlantic Charter agreement of 1941; those made at the Cairo and Teheran Conferences in 1943 and at Yalta and Potsdam in 1945, all of which were made by the President alone without submission to or

ratification by the Senate; also the potato executive agreement of November 23, 1948, likewise unsubmitted and unratified, but which the United States is now attempting to enforce through the Supreme Court, notwithstanding it was held invalid by the Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit (*United States v. Capps, Inc.* (204 Fed. 2d 655)) and by the trial court (100 Fed. Supp. 30), partly because it constituted a clear violation of a valid act of Congress. Reference is also made to the efforts of our State Department (partly successful) to bypass or nullify by executive agreements the will of Congress expressed in the Stockpiling Acts, relating to strategic materials. To the extent of their success, such agreements might make it necessary for this country, in the event of war, to depend upon supplies wholly inaccessible except by the use of long sealanes. Reference is made, further, to the Warsaw Convention, ratified by the Senate in 1928, whereby the right of recovery of an airline passenger holding an international ticket is limited, even where a crash occurs in this country, to about \$8,500; and to the Pandora's box of proposed treaties and covenants (including the Human Rights and Genocide Covenants) prepared or preparing in the mills of the United Nations, under some of which a citizen of this country might be haled before and tried and convicted by a foreign court, without a jury, for expressing his opinion or practicing his religion in this country. Finally, reference is made to the fact that at least one of our congressional committees has been refused full information as to all of this Nation's unfulfilled commitments under executive agreements on the ground of national security; and

"Whereas to rescue the rights and powers of the States from such Federal encroachments, and to protect the people in the enjoyment of their constitutional rights and liberties, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in 1953 reported out favorably Senate Joint Resolution No. 1, introduced by Senator JOHN W. BRICKER, of Ohio, and many other Senators, including the Honorable PRICE DANIEL, but no favorable or satisfactory action has so far been taken thereon; and

"Whereas it is evident that under the decisions, treaties, and agreements mentioned above the rights and powers of the sovereign States and the constitutional rights and liberties of the people of the United States have already been violated and are in great danger of further encroachment and possible destruction by unwarranted and injudicious exercise of the so-called treaty-making power; and that this danger is enhanced by the multitude of treaties, conventions, and international compacts and agreements which have been and probably will be proposed by the United Nations and other international associations: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of Texas (the house of representatives concurring):

"SECTION 1. That the Legislature of the State of Texas hereby petitions the Congress of the United States that during its present session it submit to the States for ratification a proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States for the purpose of limiting the treaty-making power so that, if ratified by the States, (1) no provision of a treaty or other international compact or agreement which conflicts with the Constitution of the United States shall have any force or effect; (2) no international compact or agreement which has not been concurred in by the Senate, as provided in article II of the Constitution, shall be, or have the dignity or legal effect of, a treaty under article

VI of the Constitution; (3) no treaty or other international compact or agreement shall be effective as internal law within the United States except to the extent it may be made so by an act of Congress enacted to enforce or implement the same; (4) no treaty shall be concurred in by the Senate except by the affirmative vote of two-thirds of a quorum of the Senate, on which the yeas and nays shall be entered on the journal; and (5) the Constitution shall not be in any way or to any extent altered or amended except by one of the methods provided in article V thereof.

"SEC. 2. Promptly after the passage of this resolution the Secretary of the Senate shall transmit a certified copy of this resolution to each of the following:

"(a) The Vice President and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States; and

"(b) The members of the Texas delegation in the Congress of the United States."

A resolution adopted by Parlor No. 271, Native Daughters of the Golden West, Wawona, Calif., protesting against the admission of Red China into the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by Anchorage Igloo, No. 15, Pioneers of Alaska, and its Auxiliary No. 4, protesting against any partition of the Territory of Alaska in the formation of a future State; ordered to lie on the table.

#### BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MARTIN:

S. 3356. A bill for the relief of Helen Zafred Urbanic;

S. 3357. A bill for the relief of Dimitrios Antoniou Kostalas; and

S. 3358. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Clementi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUTLER of Maryland:

S. 3359. A bill to repeal the act authorizing the construction, protection, operation, and maintenance of a public airport in or in the vicinity of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. EASTLAND:

S. 3360. A bill to provide for the allotment of additional cotton acreage to relieve hardship in the case of certain farms; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 3361. A bill to increase the basic rates of compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

S. 3362. A bill for the relief of Oskar Aszmoneit; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (by request):

S. 3363. A bill to provide medical care for dependents of members of the Armed Forces of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(See the remarks of Mr. SALTONSTALL when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska (by request):

S. 3364. A bill to amend the act of October 31, 1949 (63 Stat. 1049); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SCHOEPEL:

S. 3365. A bill to authorize a modification of the project for flood protection for the

Kansas Citys, Kans. and Mo.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MARTIN:

S. J. Res. 151. Joint resolution placing individuals who served in the temporary forces of the United States Navy during the Spanish-American War in the same status as those individuals who served in the Army for equal periods of time during that war and who were given furloughs or leaves upon being mustered out of the service; to the Committee on Armed Services.

#### MEDICAL CARE FOR DEPENDENTS OF MEMBERS OF ARMED FORCES

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, by request, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill recommended by the Department of Defense, to provide for medical care for dependents of members of the Armed Forces of the United States, and for other purposes.

I ask that the accompanying letter of transmittal explaining the provisions in detail and a Department of Defense facts sheet summarizing the important features of the bill be printed in the RECORD immediately following the listing of the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter and facts sheet will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3363) to provide medical care for dependents of members of the Armed Forces of the United States, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. SALTONSTALL, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

The letter and facts sheet accompanying the bill are as follows:

OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT

SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,

Washington, D. C., April 27, 1954.

TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is forwarded herewith a draft of legislation "to provide medical care for dependents of members of the Armed Forces of the United States, and for other purposes."

This proposal is a part of the Department of Defense legislative program for 1954, and the Bureau of the Budget advises that it has no objection to the presentation of this proposal to the Congress. It is recommended that this proposal be enacted by the Congress.

#### PURPOSE OF THE LEGISLATION

This proposed legislation authorizes the Department of Defense to provide medical care for all eligible dependents of military personnel wherever located. Heretofore, medical care has been largely confined to those living near military medical installations. Although those living at a distance have been eligible for such care, as a practical matter adequate medical attention could not be provided them. Additionally, in congested areas, military medical facilities were often inadequate to meet the needs.

On April 1, 1953, the Secretary of Defense established a Citizens Advisory Commission on Medical Care for Dependents of Military Personnel to study this problem. The Chairman of the Committee was Dr. Harold G. Moulton, president emeritus of the Brookings Institution, Washington, D. C. Other members were Thomas L. Parkinson, president of the Equitable Life Insurance Company of America, New York City; Dr. Lewis

Webster Jones, president of Rutgers University, New Brunswick, N. J.; Mrs. Eugene Meyer, student and writer on social problems, Washington, D. C.; and Dr. George William Bachman, senior staff member in charge of health studies of the Brookings Institution, Washington, D. C. In June 1953 the Commission submitted its report and recommendation, copies of which were sent to the Armed Services Committees of the House and Senate.

Basic recommendations of the Commission are incorporated into this proposed legislation. Some of the salient features of the program which this proposal would authorize are:

1. The present system of medical care would be supplemented by the use of civilian facilities when military facilities are not available with the Government meeting a substantial part, but not all, of the costs.

2. The medical care provided heretofore has not been complete, and it has differed in extent in the three services. The limiting factor in general has been the availability of facilities; but at the same time certain types of illnesses have been excluded as a practical matter. The Commission recommended uniformity in practice throughout the Armed Forces as well as strict limitations with respect to the illnesses covered.

3. Specifically excluded from the bill are the following: Hospitalization for domiciliary care and chronic diseases, and chronic mental and nervous disorders, the provision of prosthetic devices, hearing aids, orthopedic footwear, and spectacles (however, overseas and in remote areas of the United States where if available from military stocks prosthetic devices, hearing aids, orthopedic footwear, and spectacles may be provided at cost prices to the Government), ambulance service except in acute emergency and home calls except in special cases as determined by the cognizant physician. Dental treatment is restricted to emergency dental care except outside the United States and in remote areas where adequate civilian dental facilities are not available. In such cases dental treatment may be provided from military dental sources but will depend upon the availability of space, facilities, and capabilities of the dental staff. The bill specifically provides that dental treatment is not authorized at Government expense through civilian dental sources, except as a necessary adjunct to medical or surgical treatment.

4. Medical care would be provided for the following: Diagnosis; treatment of acute medical and surgical conditions; treatment of contagious diseases; immunization; and maternity and infant care.

5. The limitations on the type of medical care provided dependents under this bill is an important factor in keeping the costs of the program down; however, the universalization of the program will involve substantial additional costs under present conditions. The Commission pointed out, however, that in the long run, that is, when world tensions are eased, only career personnel would be involved and there would be few who could not be cared for at military medical installations; hence the costs of the broadened program should progressively decline.

6. The recommendations of the Commission call for uniform regulations pertaining to eligibility. The Commission recommended that all Regular, or Reserve and inducted members, of the Armed Forces on active duty and certain categories of retired members be eligible for care of their dependents.

7. The proposed legislation incorporates various safeguards and specifically gives the Secretary of Defense the authority to promulgate regulations and to fix such charges

as he deems appropriate in order to implement this legislation fairly and to prevent excessive demands for medical care. This legislation is also designed to be flexible enough to provide a basis in law for the needs in this area during peacetime and in times of national emergency.

Sincerely yours,

R. A. BUDDKE  
(For the Assistant Secretary).

**SECTIONAL ANALYSIS OF A BILL TO PROVIDE MEDICAL CARE FOR DEPENDENTS OF MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES OF THE UNITED STATES, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES**

Section 1 provides for the short title.

Section 2 provides a declaration of policy by the Congress.

Section 3 defines certain terms used in the bill. It should be noted that section 3 (a) (2) is intended to cover persons of the Regular components who are retired and those of the Reserve components who, for all practical purposes, are like those of the Regular components. It does not cover those individuals entitled to receive retired or retirement pay pursuant to title III of the Army and Air Force Vitalization and Retirement Equalization Act of 1948.

Section 4 provides for medical care of dependents of the members of the Armed Forces in accordance with the provisions of the act and subject to the regulations of the Secretary of Defense as approved by the President.

Section 5 (a) provides that military medical facilities will be used whenever space and facilities are available.

Section 5 (b) provides that when military medical facilities are not available or capable of providing the authorized type of treatment, dependents are authorized medical care from civilian sources. Schedules of maximum fees and costs for such medical care would be established by the Secretary of Defense.

Section 6 (a) provides that in order to prevent excessive demands for medical care under this act, dependents shall be responsible for contributing to the cost of such care.

Section 6 (b) provides the Secretary of Defense is authorized to establish charges for any subsistence given in connection with medical care.

Section 6 (c) provides that amounts received in payment for subsistence and medical care rendered dependents in military medical facilities shall be deposited to the credit of the appropriation supporting the maintenance and operation or subsistence of the military medical facilities furnishing the care.

Section 6 (d) provides that amounts received in payment for medical care rendered dependents by civilian medical sources shall be deposited to the credit of the medical appropriation of the military department of which the sponsor is a member.

Section 7 provides that if the Secretary of Defense finds it more economical, he may contract for dependent medical care under such private insurance plan as he deems appropriate.

Section 8 provides for the types of medical care authorized.

Section 9 provides for the types of hospitalization not authorized.

Section 10 (a) provides for further limitations on medical care. Prosthetic devices, hearing aids, orthopedic footwear, and spectacles are not authorized. However, outside the United States and in remote stations where adequate civilian facilities are not available these devices, if available from Government stocks, may be provided to dependents at cost prices to the Government.

Section 10 (b) provides for limitations on ambulance service and home calls.

Section 11 provides the extent to which dental treatment may be given to dependents of members of the Armed Forces. It specifically provides that dental treatment is not authorized through civilian medical sources except as a necessary adjunct to medical or surgical treatment.

Section 12 provides that when an individual serving on active duty as a member of the Coast Guard dies while the Coast Guard is operating as a part of the Navy, his widow and dependents shall be eligible for medical care the same as if such individual had been a member of the Navy on active duty.

Section 13 authorizes appropriation of funds to carry out the provisions of this act.

Section 14 (a) (1) repeals the act of July 5, 1884 (10 U. S. C. 96) which provides that the medical officers of the Army and contract surgeons shall whenever practicable attend the families of the officers and soldiers free of charge.

Section 14 (a) (2) repeals the act of May 10, 1943 (24 U. S. C. 32-36) relating to the hospitalization of dependents of naval and Marine Corps personnel, and the limitations with respect to medical, surgical, or hospital services that may be rendered.

Section 14 (a) (3) repeals that part of section 326 (b) of the act of July 1, 1944, 58 Stat. 697, which reads as follows:

"Such cost shall be at such uniform rate as may be prescribed from time to time by the President for the hospitalization of dependents of naval and Marine Corps personnel at any naval hospital, pursuant to section 2 of the act of May 10, 1943 (57 Stat. 80)."

Section 14 (a) (4) repeals Public Law 108, approved June 20, 1949, to the extent that it authorizes hospital and medical care for dependents of the regular and reserve components of the Armed Forces.

Section 14 (b) provides that all laws and parts of laws to the extent that they are inconsistent with the provisions of this proposal are hereby repealed.

Section 15 provides that this legislation shall be effective 90 days from the date of its enactment.

**FACTS SHEET PREPARED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE RE PROPOSED LEGISLATION FOR MEDICAL CARE FOR DEPENDENTS OF ARMED FORCES PERSONNEL**

1. The provisions of this proposal will provide uniform practices for all the armed services with respect to medical services for eligible dependents of Armed Forces personnel. The proposal also lists the type of illnesses to be treated, uniform regulations pertaining to eligibility and the extension of service to dependents of members of the Reserve on extended active duty and certain categories of retired members.

2. Types of medical care to be provided by this proposal include diagnosis, care for acute medical and surgical conditions, treatment of contagious diseases, immunization, and maternity and infant care.

3. The bill specifically excludes domiciliary care and chronic diseases; nervous and mental disorders, except for diagnosis; elective medical and surgical treatment as determined by the cognizant physician; unnecessary ambulance service and home calls which are not medically necessary.

4. Prosthetic devices, hearing aids, orthopedic footwear and spectacles likewise are excluded except where adequate civilian facilities are not available. These devices, however, may be furnished at Government cost if they are available from military stocks.

5. Military medical facilities will be used for the medical care of dependents subject

to the availability of space, facilities, and capabilities of the medical staff. The bill provides that dependents' care will in no way interfere with the provision of proper medical care for military personnel.

6. Dependent medical care will be provided from duly licensed civilian physicians and surgeons and accredited civilian hospitals and treatment facilities whenever military facilities are unavailable or incapable of providing authorized treatment required, or when the situation is of an emergency nature. The Secretary of Defense will prescribe regulations defining medical emergency and, in consultation with medical associations and other appropriate agencies and individuals, will establish maximum fees for civilian professional services.

7. As a restraint on excessive demands for medical attention, dependents will be required to contribute to the costs. In civilian facilities they will pay the first \$10 of the cost of each illness plus not more than 10 percent of the total cost, except in maternity cases for which there will be no charges. In military-facilities charges, if any, will be limited to those established by the Secretary of Defense, who also will fix standard subsistence charges.

8. Dental treatment, limited to such emergency care as is necessary to relieve pain or suffering or as a necessary adjunct to medical or surgical treatment, will be provided only at military facilities, depending on the availability of space, facilities, and capabilities of the staff. Treatment in civilian facilities is not authorized except as a necessary adjunct to medical-surgical treatment. Outside the United States and in remote areas within the United States where adequate civilian dental facilities are not available, treatment will be afforded by military facilities.

9. The proposed act applies to the wife (or husband), children, parents and parents-in-law of a member of the Armed Forces if such are, in fact, dependent on the member for more than half of their support.

10. Widows and dependent children of deceased servicemen who were members at the time of death will be authorized care at military facilities, but not at Government expense through civilian medical sources. This privilege will expire when such a widow remarries, however.

11. A member of the Armed Forces is considered to be an enlisted person or officer serving in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Air Force (or Coast Guard when operating as part of the Navy), whether enlisted, inducted, called, or conscripted. Included also are members of the Reserve components who are on extended active duty of more than 90 days. Reservists on short training tours are not included.

12. The Secretary of Defense is granted the authority to contract for dependent medical care under a private insurance plan, if such action is deemed more economical.

13. Terms of the proposed legislation were based on the report of the Citizens Advisory Commission on Medical Care for Dependents of Military Personnel, set up by the Secretary of Defense on April 1, 1953, to study this problem. The group was headed by Dr. Harold G. Moulton, who submitted the Commission's report and recommendations in June 1953.

#### HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The following bills and joint resolutions were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H. R. 303. An act to transfer the maintenance and operation of hospital and health

facilities for Indians to the Public Health Service, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2010. An act to authorize the sale of certain land in Alaska to the Alaska Evangelization Society, of Levelock, Alaska, for missionary purposes;

H. R. 2844. An act providing that the ratification of the Revenue Bond Act of 1935, enacted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, shall apply to all amendments of said act made by said legislature to and including the acts of the 1953 regular session of said legislature, and to all extensions of the period for issuance and delivery of revenue bonds thereunder, heretofore, or hereafter enacted by said legislature;

H. R. 2849. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the transfer of land from the War Department to the Territory of Hawaii," approved June 19, 1936;

H. R. 5831. An act to enable the Hawaiian Homes Commission of the Territory of Hawaii to exchange available lands as designated by the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920, and for other publicly owned lands; and

H. R. 6786. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to purchase improvements or pay damages for removal of improvements located on public lands of the United States in the Palisades project area, Palisades reclamation project, Idaho; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 733. An act for the relief of Hildegard H. Nelson;

H. R. 868. An act for the relief of Ciriaco Catino;

H. R. 944. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Zygmunt Sowinski;

H. R. 1115. An act for the relief of Mrs. Suhula Adata;

H. R. 1370. An act for the relief of Guy H. Davant;

H. R. 1665. An act for the relief of Carl Piowaty and W. J. Piowaty;

H. R. 1673. An act for the relief of James I. Smith;

H. R. 1762. An act for the relief of Sugako Nakai;

H. R. 1768. An act for the relief of Claire Louise Carey and Vincent F. Carey;

H. R. 1788. An act for the relief of Wanda Luceri, also known as Sister Cecilia; Maria De Padova, also known as Sister Rosanna; Anna Santoro, also known as Sister Natalina; Valentina Ruffoni, also known as Sister Severina; Cosima Russo, also known as Sister Carmelina;

H. R. 1912. An act for the relief of Hayik (Jirair) Vartiyian, Annemarie Vartiyian, and Susanig Armenuhi Vartiyian;

H. R. 2024. An act for the relief of Frank L. Peyton;

H. R. 2028. An act for the relief of Mrs. Antonietta Palmieri;

H. R. 2181. An act for the relief of Richard Karl Hoffman;

H. R. 2403. An act for the relief of Laszlo Varga and Nike Varga;

H. R. 2627. An act for the relief of Cecilia Lucy Boyack;

H. R. 2630. An act for the relief of Balbino Acusin Ariasa;

H. R. 2899. An act for the relief of Igor Shwabe;

H. R. 3017. An act for the relief of Felix Petrover;

H. R. 3333. An act for the relief of Julia N. Emmanuel;

H. R. 3624. An act for the relief of Peter M. Leaming;

H. R. 3675. An act for the relief of Herre van der Veen, Mrs. Marie van der Veen, Helen Winifred van der Veen, and Jan Herre van der Veen;

H. R. 3743. An act for the relief of Chaim Szemaja Segal and Ieek Hersz Segal;

H. R. 3907. An act for the relief of Jean Sutherland;

H. R. 3951. An act for the relief of Frank G. Koch;

H. R. 4248. An act for the relief of Albertas Bauras;

H. R. 4330. An act for the relief of Dr. Orlando Artuso and family;

H. R. 4474. An act for the relief of Frederick Joseph Buttaccio and others;

H. R. 4638. An act for the relief of David W. Wallace;

H. R. 5185. An act for the relief of Klyce Motors, Inc.;

H. R. 5340. An act for the relief of Tibor, Szuzsa (Susanne), and Judith Sauer;

H. R. 5354. An act for the relief of Liborio Guido Rutilio;

H. R. 5684. An act for the relief of Walter Kuznicki;

H. R. 5986. An act for the relief of Harold E. Wahlberg;

H. R. 6148. An act for the relief of Han Jong Haing;

H. R. 7049. An act for the relief of Basil Theodossiou;

H. R. 7140. An act for the relief of Robert A. Duval;

H. R. 7145. An act for the relief of Anneliese Catalino;

H. R. 7150. An act for the relief of Thora June Grumbles;

H. R. 7761. An act for the relief of John Lewis Pyles, Jr.; and

H. J. Res. 476. Joint resolution to confer jurisdiction on the Attorney General to determine the eligibility of certain aliens to benefit under section 6 of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5605. An act to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to provide for payment of taxes or payments in lieu of taxes with respect to real property transferred from Government corporations to other agencies of the Federal Government; and

H. R. 6290. An act to discontinue certain reports now required by law; to the Committee on Government Operations.

#### EXPOSITION ON REHABILITATION AND EMPLOYMENT OF THE PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I should like to call to the attention of the Senate an event in Washington that will commence tomorrow, April 28, and will extend through to April 30, inclusive. I refer to the Exposition and Parade of Progress on Rehabilitation and Employment of the Physically Handicapped, to be held at the Departmental Auditorium on Constitution Avenue. It will show the great strides that have been made during the past 25 years in hiring handicapped individuals; and there will be many exhibits of prosthetic devices and work aids which have been developed in recent years to make it possible for disabled persons to earn their own livelihood.

The President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped is jointly sponsoring this event with the District Commissioner's committee. I have been asked by Maj. Gen. Melvin J. Maas, Chairman of the President's Committee, to extend a cordial invitation to all Members of the Senate and their families.

I do not believe there has ever been a time in the history of this country when such an exhibit has been assembled

under one roof. There will be many displays showing actually handicapped persons at work, demonstrating how they have overcome disabilities and returned to productive livelihood. I am certain that most of the Members of the Senate will want to attend this affair, and I believe it will open their eyes to the progress that has been made in this field. Let me repeat the time and place: The Departmental Auditorium, April 28 to 30, inclusive, from noon until 5 p. m., and from 7 to 10 p. m.

#### THE SITUATION AT FORT MONMOUTH

**Mr. LEHMAN.** Mr. President, the impression has gained wide circulation that the Army installation at Fort Monmouth is riddled with a horde of traitors, spies, and saboteurs who have been uncovered by the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY]. This much publicized report appears to be completely contrary to the facts. Yesterday, at the so-called McCarthy inquiry, the Secretary of the Army made public figures concerning the Fort Monmouth employees suspended as security risks by the Army as a result of its investigations of its employees, initiated many months ago. The suspensions number about 35. Of these, many have already been reinstated. I am advised that none of the 35 persons originally suspended has invoked the protection of the fifth amendment or has refused to answer any questions. What is of particular importance, moreover, is that, according to the best available information, none of the Monmouth employees has been accused of disloyalty or espionage. I understand that the main charge against all these men is guilt by association—not treason, disloyalty, or espionage. The Fort Monmouth investigation, long effectively carried on by the Army, is undoubtedly a matter of great interest to the people of this country, particularly at this time.

However, as the New York Times points out editorially, it is highly important that the Monmouth investigation be kept in proper perspective. The Times has today published an extremely interesting editorial entitled "The Monmouth Story," in which it discusses the situation, and points out some of the flagrant misconceptions and misstatements that have gained wide currency. The editorial is so interesting and informative that I ask unanimous consent to have it printed at this point in the body of the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

##### THE MONMOUTH STORY

In his testimony at the McCarthy inquiry yesterday, Secretary Stevens at last made public official figures concerning the Fort Monmouth employees suspended as security

risks. This information is of interest because of the repeated suggestions by Ray H. Jenkins, committee counsel, that Senator McCARTHY's much-publicized investigation into Fort Monmouth had produced significant results in protecting the Nation against subversion.

Secretary Stevens noted that since the President's new security procedure went into effect last spring, a total of 35 Fort Monmouth employees had been suspended. He said 13 of these were reinstated in nonsensitive positions, because "no charges of sufficient substance" had been brought against them. Of the remaining, 22 must have had hearings before the appropriate boards, which have not yet given their reports, and the rest are awaiting their hearings. None of these 35 has pleaded the fifth amendment or refused to answer any question.

According to the best information available, not one of these Monmouth employees is accused of disloyalty or espionage. All are believed to have been investigated on prior occasions. The recent charges all involve association with Communist or Communist-front organizations or with individuals—including relatives in several cases—who have been so associated. In this connection it is ironic that the Voice of America announced a few days ago that it was broadcasting to the Russian people this commentary: "Only the Communists believe in the law which they have made that holds a person responsible for the acts of his relatives or friends. Only the Kremlin finds such a law necessary."

Be that as it may, the American people and the Army, and presumably Senator McCARTHY, are all in agreement that even one genuine security risk within the Federal service is one too many. But did Senator McCARTHY help to eliminate even one at Fort Monmouth? Secretary Stevens admitted that in some instances the process of suspension was hastened, but he assured the committee that all these cases were under reinvestigation, anyway, and that "We had information about all of these people and the action would have been taken."

What Senator McCARTHY undoubtedly did was to hand out to the press "a great deal of misinformation" and stir up a great deal of excitement that caused "a lot of harm" to the operations at Fort Monmouth. Apparently the Army itself became frightened by the McCarthy pressure and rushed into some security charges that even Mr. McCARTHY would not have taken seriously. Only yesterday a report by the Federation of American Scientists was published, alleging that "substantial damage to defense research" has been caused by the whole hullabaloo. The Fort Monmouth investigation is playing an important part in the current inquiry, and it is necessary that it be kept in proper perspective.

#### INVESTIGATION IN CONNECTION WITH BILL FOR THE RELIEF OF KIRILL M. ALEXEEV, HIS WIFE AND MINOR CHILDREN

**Mr. BUTLER** of Maryland. Mr. President, on April 5, 1954, in the discussion pertaining to S. 855, a bill for the relief of Kirill Mihailovich Alexeev, his wife and minor children, I indicated that an FBI investigation had been conducted. By way of further clarification, I now ask that a letter received from Deputy Attorney General William P. Rogers be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,  
OFFICE OF THE DEPUTY  
ATTORNEY GENERAL,  
Washington, April 20, 1954.  
**HON. JOHN M. BUTLER,**  
United States Senate,  
Washington, D. C.

**DEAR SENATOR BUTLER:** It is noted that you are recorded on page 4566 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 5, 1954, as being of the impression that the FBI conducts an investigation relative to all private immigration bills, and particularly that a full investigation was made by the FBI in connection with S. 855, a bill for the relief of Kirill Mihailovich Alexeev, his wife, and minor children.

Although investigations are made by this Department for the purpose of complying with requests of the Senate and House Judiciary Committees for reports on private immigration bills, such investigations are conducted by the Immigration and Naturalization Service and not by the FBI.

The FBI does not make such investigations, and consequently did not make one for this purpose in the case of the private bill for the relief of Kirill Alexeev and his family. However, the Immigration and Naturalization Service, as a matter of routine in conducting its investigations, requests that the FBI and other appropriate agencies make a name check of their files for any pertinent information which may be available concerning the beneficiaries of the bills. In the event that the FBI or the other agencies have such information, it is furnished to the Service for its consideration in the preparation of the reports to the committees.

It was thought that you might appreciate this clarification of investigative procedure in connection with private immigration bills being brought to your attention.

Sincerely,

**WILLIAM P. ROGERS,**  
Deputy Attorney General.

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION

**Mr. KNOWLAND.** I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

#### EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no reports of committees, the clerk will proceed to state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

#### UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGES

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Dal M. Lemmon to be United States circuit judge for the ninth circuit.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Richard Harvey Chambers to be United States circuit judge for the ninth circuit.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

#### UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Lawrence Edward Walsh to be United States district judge for the southern district of New York.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

#### CIRCUIT COURTS, TERRITORY OF HAWAII

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Frank Aloysius McKinley to be fourth judge, first circuit, circuit courts, Territory of Hawaii.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

#### UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of William T. Plummer to be United States attorney for division No. 3, district of Alaska.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

#### POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of all nominations confirmed this day.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

#### LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. KNOWLAND. I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

#### DEVELOPMENT OF THE DOMESTIC WOOL INDUSTRY

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2911) to provide for the development of a sound and profitable domestic wool industry under our national policy of expanding world trade, to encourage increased domestic production of wool for our national security, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana

[Mr. ELLENDER] on behalf of himself and other Senators.

Under the unanimous-consent agreement, all time on this amendment is controlled by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER]. The Senator from Louisiana has 30 minutes and the Senator from Vermont has 30 minutes.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President—  
The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Louisiana is recognized.

Mr. ELLENDER. I wish to modify my amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. How much time does the Senator yield himself?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield myself 5 minutes.

I wish to modify my amendment, in line 4, by striking the comma after "1955" and inserting in lieu thereof a period; also by striking "and 1956", striking the comma after "1954", and inserting at that point the word "and" so that the amendment will read:

SEC. 10. Section 101 (d) (6) of the Agricultural Act of 1949 (7 U. S. C., sec. 1441 (d) (6)), as amended, is amended by striking out "1953 and 1954" and inserting in lieu thereof "1953, 1954, and 1955."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator has the right to modify his amendment.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, the purpose of the modification of my amendment is to extend the present farm program for only another year, instead of 2 years, as originally proposed by me and the cosponsors of the amendment.

I have already outlined in great detail the reasons why the present system of 90 percent of parity price supports for the basic commodities should be retained and preferred over the flexible program advanced by the administration. Since the Senate is operating under a limitation of debate, I shall but reiterate the primary reasons why I believe my amendment should be adopted; if Senators desire to study the data with which I have documented these conclusions, I invite them to consult the RECORD of last Friday, April 23, pages 5349 through 5456.

It strikes me that it would be folly for us at this time to change the rigid price-support program with respect to basic commodities to a flexible price-support program. As I indicated earlier in this debate, the end result, namely, the further depression of farm prices, would reflect no benefit to the consumer, since the spread is so great between farm prices and the prices you and I must pay to purchase the food and fiber products we consume. As economists have indicated before the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, a 5-cent-per-pound reduction in the price of cotton would reduce the price of a \$3 cotton shirt by only 7 cents, but it would cost the cotton industry \$350 million. The loss of this amount of money would be a tremendous economic blow, not only to the cotton industry, but to those indus-

tries which market their goods among cotton farmers.

It is obvious to me that to reduce farm prices to the point made possible under the flexible parity concept would be to invite disaster. Such reductions would not ease the consumer's lot; they would only hurt the small farmer, the man who operates the one-family farm, and who is unable to mechanize his operations. Since this small operator's margin of profit is so slender, the adoption of the so-called sliding scale would result in his destruction; it would mean that the little man would be gobbled up by his larger competitor, whose vast acreages are more conducive to mechanization and mass production of food and fiber on a smaller margin of profit. It would be the height of shortsightedness for us to concentrate our lifeblood—food and fiber—in the hands of but a few of our people.

Another argument advanced by Mr. Benson and other proponents of the flexible price-support program against the present program is the alleged cost of the 90 percent of parity price-support program. Last Friday I submitted proof to demonstrate that the price-support program on basic commodities has not cost the \$16 billion which was indicated by the Secretary of Agriculture. Over a period of 20 years the cost of this program for the basics to the Treasury of the United States has been only little more than \$21 million.

The entire price support program, for all commodities—perishables, nonperishables, and so forth—has cost only a little more than \$1 billion since its inception in 1932. This is not an exorbitant cost. As a matter of fact, we have seen that the program of tax amortization for defense facilities undertaken during the Korean war alone has cost our Government nearly 16 times that much. Certainly, a healthy agriculture is as vital a component of our national security as a healthy industry. Yet, we see the paradoxical situation whereby the present price-support program is being labeled too costly while, in reality, it has cost our Government in 20 years only about one-sixteenth as much as the defense facilities tax amortization program has cost during the past 4 years.

If our present farm program is changed overnight, as will be the case if the flexible program now advocated by the administration is enacted, there is no question but that the effect will be to subject the Secretary of Agriculture to a great temptation to reduce support prices to the minimum—that is, 75 percent of parity. This temptation will result because of the burdensome surpluses which plague our agriculture at this time and which will make it highly probable that the Secretary will fix support prices at the minimum of 75 percent of parity.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished

Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from South Carolina is recognized.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield to me for the purpose of sending to the desk an amendment to the pending bill?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I am glad to yield, provided it does not take away any of my time.

Mr. KERR. The Senator from Oklahoma merely wishes to send to the desk an amendment to the pending bill.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield for that purpose.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be received and printed, and will lie on the table.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, at the present time the Senate is considering a bill which, in my opinion, if enacted, would vitally affect all the people of the United States. I do not believe that I need to call to the attention of Senators the fact that in the case of every depression we have suffered, there has first been a decline in the farm economy. In my judgment, if we put into effect at this time a flexible price-support program, or a sliding scale of supports, it will affect the prices of all the basic commodities which the farmer grows.

The people who purchase such commodities feel that if we have a large supply on hand—and we do have a large supply on hand at the present time—the Government will then slide the scale down from 90 to 85, 80, or 75 percent, because of the surplus.

I know that those in favor of the sliding scale will say, "Oh, no. We are going to take 4 million bales of cotton out of circulation." Nevertheless, the 4 million bales would still be in existence; and if we try to handle the problem under a sliding scale, we shall find that sooner or later that cotton will be counted against the farmer, and his support, instead of being 90, will slide down. That is what the public believes, and we cannot educate the public to take a different view, no matter what we do.

The farmers of the United States are crying for 90 percent of parity at the present time because they feel that they need it.

Speaking of the sliding scale or flexible scale, Mr. President, let no one assert that it will not affect the price.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to speak for 1 additional minute.

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield 1 additional minute to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Only a few days ago the Secretary of Agriculture, speaking to a group of women in Washington, said that he would reduce the parity on butter from 90 percent to 75 percent, and that they

would be able to buy butter for 10 or 12 cents a pound cheaper because of that reduction. Is that not conclusive evidence that if we have anything but rigid support it will be possible for him to slide the scale one way or another? People know that to be the case, and that will also have an effect on the price of the commodity.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes. I shall not speak on the merits or demerits of the rigid or flexible price supports. There will be ample opportunity for such discussion during the rest of the session.

The modification of the Senator's amendment provides for rigid 90 percent of parity price support for 1 year instead of 2 years, and does not improve the amendment at all. It merely assures confusion for one more year. It seems to me that in the interest of orderly legislation we should not accept any amendment to the wool bill which does not deal with wool. I am opposed to any such amendment offered to the wool bill.

We have held extensive hearings on the general farm price-support program. The hearings have run for many weeks. The proceedings of half of the hearings have been printed; the other half will be printed within a few days.

I might say that we have called an executive meeting of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry for tomorrow, to begin work on legislation looking toward an improved farm program.

Let us not disturb the situation now by adding nonwool amendments to the wool bill. Let us not do anything to hurt the sheep raisers of this country by confusing the issue in the pending bill.

There will be plenty of opportunity from now on to debate and to vote on the merits of rigid price supports or flexible price supports.

Therefore, Mr. President, I hope that none of the crippling amendments proposed will be added to the wool bill.

I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPEL].

Mr. SCHOEPEL. Mr. President, I wish to say at the outset that I cannot support the position taken by the distinguished Senator from Louisiana. I shall not support the amendment he has offered, because I feel that the wool bill ought to stand on its own merits.

The President of the United States has a right to suggest to Congress what his program shall be. The President, in his wisdom and good judgment, appointed a committee, which committee was representative of all sections of the farming industry throughout the country, to report to him on the farm program. That committee reported to the President.

Based upon the committee's report, the President submitted his message to Congress. The Committee on Agriculture and Forestry then started orderly hearings to determine what kind of bill should be presented to the Senate. The hearings have continued for many weeks. Representatives of all segments of agriculture have been heard. The hearings closed only a few days ago, and we do not

yet have full printed reports of the hearings.

Senators will have an opportunity to submit the various and sundry questions that are in their minds when the bill to be drafted reaches the Senate floor.

Shall we nullify the work that has been accomplished through the orderly procedures of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry by accepting amendments which in a few short lines would nullify the whole program? This is an important program. I do not think it would be in the interest of good legislation to do anything like that.

We will have an opportunity to present our arguments and our views and to thrash our points of view out in an orderly manner. Therefore, I shall vote against the amendments, with the hope and expectation that through the deliberations of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, we will be able to harmonize our views when the committee reports a bill on this important subject.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I yield 4 minutes to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I wish to express again my hope that the wool producers, who have supported the pending bill, will have a clean bill go through the Senate and not have it encumbered with amendments.

We have tried hard to have a wool bill adopted that will do justice to the wool people. It has been a long and difficult struggle to get it before the Senate in its present good shape. I hope it will not be hamstrung with amendments.

I have stated publicly that there are two commodities—sugar and wool—which need to be treated alike, and there may be others also. There is no sense whatever in believing that we in the United States should attempt to control the world situation so far as sugar is concerned. We have never tried to do it and we cannot do it; nor can we control the importation of wool—we need large quantities of wool; nor should we assume that we will not get any tariff relief. Therefore, I believe that what we must do and should do and ought to do is to pass the pending bill, and pass it without any amendments being attached to it.

I commend the statement of the distinguished senior Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPEL]. We have asked governmental agencies to send suggestions to the Senate. We have held long and protracted hearings before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. If we had intended to write only a few lines, striking out one year and substituting another year, there would have been no purpose in the President of the United States appointing an Agricultural Advisory Committee, and there would have been no purpose in the Agricultural Advisory Committee spending months listening to testimony in an effort to determine what it should recommend. There would have been no point in the President's submitting a message to Congress on the food situation in general,

and on the subject of agricultural price supports in particular.

After those steps have been taken I believe the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry should have an opportunity to study the whole subject, to determine what there is of merit and what there is possibly of no merit in the message the President sent to Congress. Some people believe the President's suggestions are very good, and some believe they are bad. It seems to me that it is the function of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry to take the time to study the testimony given before it in an effort to determine what there is in the proposals sent to the Congress by the President that can be utilized. We should not merely consider an amendment on the floor to strike out one year and substitute another year, without being given an opportunity to study fully the proposals of the President.

I know, as a Member of the Senate, that I would have felt a little resentful if, after the President of the United States in 1948 had sent a message to Congress asking for specific studies of the agricultural program, the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry had ignored the message and had gone on its way without considering the proposal. In 1948, even though Congress was controlled by the party in opposition to the President, Congress proceeded to give careful consideration to the message the President had sent up. The House rejected what the President had proposed. The Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry accepted, in a large measure, what he had proposed. The Senate acted on it as a legislative body should act. It did not just strike out one date and insert another date. It did not merely provide for an extension. Instead, in a calm and deliberate fashion, the Senate proceeded to consider the suggestions which had been made by the President of the United States.

A different party is in power, and another President has sent to the Congress his recommendations. I do not agree with all of them. I like a great many of them, but I believe the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry should take its time to deliberate on these things and should receive some profit from the long hearings which have been held. For that reason, I shall vote against all amendments, and shall support the bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE].

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I shall support the amendment which has been offered by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], and I shall attempt to give the specific reasons why I support an amendment providing for a continuation of the 90-percent mandatory supports on the six basic commodities.

First, Mr. President, it is necessary that we continue the 90-percent supports until we shall have succeeded in reducing the overall production. That can be brought about only by reducing

the number of acres planted or harvested. That is being done. The farmers responded the moment they were asked to reduce acreage. They responded last fall in connection with the planting of winter wheat. They are responding as to the planting of cotton and corn. Those are the first necessary steps toward getting our production down to manageable proportions.

We must not reduce the supports next year, because in the carryovers there are now 875 million bushels of wheat. There are 9,600,000 bales of cotton. There are 900 million bushels of corn. If we lower the supports at this time, legislatively we will cause our farm income to drop nationally. What we first must do is to isolate the surpluses, or reduce the production annually until we have proven our ability in that respect, the market will drop immediately to price levels at which we reestablish the supports.

When we examine what has happened to the farmer's income in the past few years, we know we must not take a step which would depress his income further, because he has lost altogether too much.

In 1947 the realized net income of farm operators from farming was just under \$17 billion, which was 49 percent of the realized gross income of slightly over \$34 billion.

Last year the net income was \$12.8 billion, according to the latest figures of the Department of Agriculture. This was 36.6 percent of the gross income, which was in excess of \$35 billion.

In other words, the gross income in 1953 was higher by \$1,098,000,000 than it was in 1947, and yet the farmers' net income was \$12,800,000,000.

We find that the farmer has lost approximately \$4 billion in his net income, even though his gross income was higher. He has lost in the past few years 9 cents of the consumer's food dollar. Anyone who says it is because of price supports that commodities have been priced out of the market is either misinformed or does not know the facts, because the actual cost of food products to the consumer is not chargeable to the farmer, for the reason that the farmer has lost 9 cents out of the consumers' food dollar.

Mr. President, those are some of the facts which have led me to believe—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield me 1 minute?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, the first step we must take is to govern the surpluses, and then we can deal with the question of what the supports should be. But as of today we must check the decline in the farmer's income, and the sooner we do that the more assured we may be that the farming communities will have their future income protected. That is why it is imperative that we amend the so-called wool bill this after-

noon and get the question of 90 percent of parity settled once and for all.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER].

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I shall oppose the pending amendment, which I think is an improper approach to the question of what the parity formula should be. I agree with the statement of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEFFEL] and with the statement of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], that the general farm program needs a reasonable examination and a reasonable study.

The Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry has been spending a great deal of time in the past few weeks, in fact, in the past 2 or 3 months, in exploring the matter of the establishment of a reliable long-range farm program.

The 90-percent parity supports will continue throughout this year, so that the amendment is not a measure which would destroy support prices at the moment. On the other hand, a number of alternative proposals have been made, and the committee is studying them.

The bill which is before the Senate is one which is intended to be devoted exclusively to the problems of wool production. I personally feel that it would be not only ill-advised but might be devastating, in fact, to a permanent, reliable farm program, if we attempted to hitch to the bill amendments like the one now before the Senate.

The question of support prices, the question of the long-range effect of farm programs, is too vital to be considered by shotgun methods on the floor of the Senate, especially when the Agriculture Committees are beginning final studies of the program and the suggestions made by all segments of the farming industry, as well as by most segments of the industrial economy of this country.

Mr. President, as one who is vitally interested in a successful and sound farm program which will protect the agricultural economy against devastation, and as a representative of one of the greatest diversified farming areas in the world, I think the method proposed is not only not good for the farm economy and the farm program, but it might well be devastating to the farm economy in the long run. It would only result in continuing the uncertainty of the farm program if we used such methods as that proposed; namely, impulsive methods, if I may use that term, in connection with the pending bill, which is a specialized bill, and not a general farm program bill. I shall fight as hard as will anyone else for the establishment of a long-range farm bill which will meet and reliably support the economy of the farmer. The pending wool bill is not one which should have attached to it the entire farm program. There will be continuation by 2 years of an uncertain program if we make the mistake of adding amendments to the wool bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Iowa has expired.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT].

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, the sheep business is one of the important industries of my State. In fact, it is the basic industry of 200 counties in the Western States.

The woolgrowers of America are in a bad way. The woolgrowing industry has been on the decline since the Japanese struck at Pearl Harbor. Sheep numbers have dropped from 49 million to 26 million head in 10 years. The sheep industry found itself dying a slow death during the war years, when every other industry in the country was booming. The cost of production skyrocketed. Notwithstanding this fact, the OPA immediately after Pearl Harbor, set an unreasonably low ceiling price on wool and maintained it throughout the war years. The sheepmen of the country were forced to take a loss of 10 cents a pound on every pound of wool that they produced and as a consequence thousands of woolgrowers were forced out of the sheep business.

The strange part about it, Mr. President, was that all this took place despite the fact that we were consuming a billion pounds of wool and producing but a third of it and the Army and Navy Munitions Board had declared wool to be a strategic material and vitally needed for the defense of the Nation.

As the distinguished Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] has just said, wool is in a special class. We in the United States produce about 28 percent of the wool we consume. Now we find ourselves in a position where the sheep population is declining at the rate of 1 million head a year. It seems to me that it is somewhat unfair to try to load this bill with amendments which would attempt to settle, on the floor of the Senate, all the major questions in the overall agricultural program. I think the best interests of the country will be served by leaving that matter for a full and complete report by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. That committee has been holding hearings, and will continue to hold them for a short time longer. In due course, I am certain that the committee will report to the Senate a bill which will represent the best judgment of the members of the great Committee on Agriculture after hearing from every segment of agriculture and from every authority in that field.

Mr. President, to my way of thinking, wool is in a class by itself. The questions involved in settling the wool problem are not at all similar to other agricultural commodities and for that reason it seems to me that the wool bill should be determined solely on its own merits. I hope that the amendments will be defeated and considered at a later and more appropriate date and that the bill be passed.

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished junior Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, much has been said about when or when not to vote for 90-percent support prices. I have found that if one wants to obtain something which is very important to him, he had better vote for it while he has the opportunity.

This is the first time, bear in mind, that wool-price-support legislation has been considered separately in peacetime legislation. In the Agricultural Act of 1948, the price support for wool was considered along with other farm commodities, that was true also in the act of 1949. Some Senators now try to make us believe that it is improper to consider all agricultural products in one bill. As Senators know, the House has agreed that they will consider all price-support legislation in a one-package bill.

As to the emergency of the situation, I realize that the woolgrowers are in difficulty. But so are other segments of the agricultural economy. It is being proposed, for example, in the Benson plan that the wheat acreage shall be cut 11 percent more in addition to the 21-percent reduction of last year. On top of that, if the acreage remains at the present 62 million acres, the ceiling on the support price for wheat next year would be 76 percent of parity.

I think all of us have heard enough about the Benson program of 75 or 76 percent of parity and what it will do to the farmers of this Nation; I see no reason for continuing consideration of that proposal further. It has been said that the Benson program is the result of a study made by farm experts all over the United States. I submit that Secretary Benson's Wheat Advisory Committee recommended a two-price system, but Secretary Benson totally ignored the recommendation of that committee. The program he has submitted is the result of a recommendation made by a very few handpicked persons; it is not the recommendation of a majority of the farmers of the Nation.

I think it is high time that the farmers of the Nation know what is in store for them in the future. They should know whether it is proposed to reduce further their prices and their income, or whether an attempt will be made to maintain prices and income at the present level, as the pending amendment would do.

I predict that if the Republican administration persists in a program of lower price supports, it will feel the effects at the next election—and it should.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I strongly support the Ellender amendment. I do so realizing that this is the only opportunity the Senate may have really to obtain a vote on what are called mandatory price supports for basic commodities.

It is my feeling that we need to recognize the philosophy which pervades and permeates the Commodity Credit Corporation and the Department of Agriculture. I have noticed, for example, that Mr. McConnell was appointed by the Secretary of Agriculture to become

Administrator of the Commodity Stabilization Service, succeeding Mr. Howard H. Gordon who, by the way, also had served as a member and as president of the Board of the Commodity Credit Corporation. For all practical purposes, Mr. McConnell is the top man in the Commodity Credit Corporation, and the Commodity Stabilization program. He attends most of the Board meetings of the Commodity Credit Corporation, and he advises it, because most of its business is administered by the Commodity Stabilization Service, which he heads. What sort of man is Mr. McConnell? What kind of philosophy has the head of the Commodity Stabilization Service? I wish to quote from what he said in a speech at Syracuse, N. Y., on November 30, 1953, on the long-run agricultural policy. Mr. McConnell charged that farm price supports are part of "a very carefully planned and carried out conspiracy to make of this country a socialistic nation."

That is the philosophy of the head of the Commodity Stabilization Service of the Government of the United States. He is a man who looks upon price supports as a part of a conspiracy to make this country into a socialistic nation.

I say we cannot trust this administration with that kind of program of flexible price supports, because what will happen will be that price supports will be flexed down to a minimum price-support level.

The distinguished junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Young] pointed out the imperative need of the American farmer to have some degree of security and surety as to what his prices will be. The American farmer lives in a market which is relatively fixed. His taxes are fixed; his cost of petroleum is fixed; his cost of machinery is fixed; his rent is generally a fixed item. It is ridiculous to assume that American agriculture can maintain any degree of stability under a flexible system when most of the commodities and services which Mr. Farmer must purchase are within a fixed economy or a legislated economy.

Mr. President, I desire to quote further from Mr. McConnell's remarks. I wish the junior Senator from North Dakota were in the Chamber at the moment to listen to what the head of the Commodity Stabilization Service said in his speech at Syracuse, as follows:

Wheat is one of the best examples of modern socialism we have in this country. The Government controls the amount of acreage we can plant. It controls pretty largely, through its support programs, the price and marketing. The production of wheat in this country is shot through and through with Government control. The laws on the books provide for acreage controls, for marketing quotas, for penalties. Good or bad, it's a perfect example of modern socialism.

I say that if a person feels that this program is modern socialism, what he is seeking to do is to try to destroy the program.

I do not favor placing on our statute books a law which would give to Mr. McConnell, or to any of his ilk, an op-

portunity to wreck the price-support program of this country.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I support the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana, and I support it in the name of security for American agriculture.

Mr. AIKEN. I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND].

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I do not question in the slightest the devotion to agriculture which is felt by every sponsor and supporter of this amendment. Nevertheless, I feel that they are making a tragic mistake by offering the amendment, and that the Senate would make such a mistake if it saw fit to agree to it.

The bill before the Senate today relates to a nonbasic commodity, of which less than one-third is produced domestically, and much more than two-thirds is imported. It is a strategic commodity, which is of very great importance to us in time of war.

The amendment seeks to attach to the bill affecting wool a provision relating to basic commodities representing 23 or 24 percent of the value of the agricultural production of the Nation. I think that is unwise and unfair.

I call the attention of my distinguished friends to the fact that when we from the cotton area were proposing a cotton bill—a very important one earlier this year—we were not interfered with in this amelioratory legislation by members representing the wool industry, even though that industry was then suffering.

I call attention to the fact that tobacco producers, whose States are represented by many Senators, were not hampered by efforts of representatives of wool producers to attach controversial wool amendments when the Senate passed vital tobacco measures.

The same is true of bills relating to peanuts and all of the other basic commodities. I think it would be exceptionally unfortunate and unfair if the Senate allowed this excellent bill to be destroyed, as I believe it would be, by the attachment of this particular amendment.

The next point I desire to make is that the surpluses on hand are generally recognized to be disastrous. There has been no farm organization which has supported any legislation before the Senate which does not, in the first instance, attempt to deal with these surpluses by having a large setaside which would be isolated from current markets and production.

Notwithstanding the fact that that is well known to all, notwithstanding the fact that every farm organization is in favor of legislation which will effectively deal with the problem, the effect of the pending amendment would be to prolong for an additional year an experience which has already been disastrous and not to settle the problem.

I heard my distinguished friend, the Senator from Minnesota, say that this amendment would solve the problem once and for all. To the contrary, this particular amendment simply would

prolong the pain and disaster for another year. Not only would it prolong the worry of groups who are greatly concerned, particularly consumer groups, but it would also prolong the deep concern of many agricultural groups who do not have the benefit of price supports, or who have other kinds of limited price supports, and who know that a prolongation of this program would not result in any favorable effect whatsoever on the agricultural program. We would not be doing the right thing toward consumers generally and to the producers of that great majority of agriculture who have no price supports, if we were to adopt this amendment.

Those who want confusion for another year, and who want continual surpluses, and who do not want this legislation to have well considered provisions as to set-asides of surpluses, should vote for the amendment because it will surely make confusion worse confounded.

There is another point I wish to make, and that is that there is no effort in the bill to take care of diverted acres. Already there are over 30 million acres diverted to other production under the three reductions which have been put in force relating to wheat, corn, and cotton acreage. These 30 million acres amount to more than the total acreage of the following six good States: Vermont, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, New Jersey, and Maryland. The Senate should not adopt a measure which leaves all that diverted acreage to make additional trouble for all the producers of other agricultural products except the ones producing the 23 percent of our total production which is covered by the basic commodities. The Senate would be doing a very unwise and unfair thing to the producers of every agricultural commodity if it insists on breaking up the unity which has heretofore prevailed in dealing with agricultural commodities. There is no better way to do that than to adopt the pending amendment, which has no provision whatever affecting the critical problem of diverted acreage.

Mr. President, I close by calling attention to the fact that there is no effort whatsoever in the proposal to alleviate the apprehension of the public on this matter. Many people who are good citizens are worried about our fiscal affairs. They see us pouring billions of dollars into an agricultural price-support program which, instead of getting us somewhere, has resulted in the piling up of unheard of surpluses, and which program has resulted in prices to the producers which have not reached the level of the guaranties made, but instead has resulted in very much lower prices, which fact is shown irrefutably by statistics. The public is also concerned with the apparent nonconcern of the Congress in this continuing deficit operation, in which Congress is pouring good money down a rathole and not accomplishing the purpose which is sought to be accomplished.

I do not think I have to say to the Senate, because every Member knows, that the industries which have been protected have not been getting the guaranteed price supports, but, instead, in every in-

stance where there have been huge surpluses, they have been getting much less. They have, as well, been seeing the prices go down, and down, and down with every passing year, instead of being held up to the support level.

The amendment simply proposes to prolong the misery for an additional year, and I use the word "misery" advisedly, because it has been misery for farmers who thought they had a price guaranteed to them, but have found there was no such guaranty, but, to the contrary, that they had to meet the situation in the markets. There is no substitute for markets. There is no substitute for the market place, where an honest product can draw an honest price paid in honest money.

Those who seek to prolong the miserable showing of the past several years are simply closing their eyes to the fact that this program has meant disaster to a lot of good people. They propose to enhance the disaster by continuing the confusion, without any idea of what is going to be our permanent peacetime program. If surpluses continue in the same manner we will throw additional billions of dollars down the rathole.

As intelligent people, it seems to me we are threatening to do something which is completely unintelligent, because we are not profiting by our mistakes and changing a program which has meant disaster. Instead, here is a serious proposal, impossible as it seems that would be the case, to continue in the future a program which has brought disaster in the past.

Mr. President, I have nothing more to say at this time. I hope that the amendment will be defeated.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Does the Senator from Florida feel that the 90-percent-of-parity program has brought disaster to the farmers?

Mr. HOLLAND. The 90-percent-of-parity program has aided in bringing about disaster. It has promoted the production of commodities beyond the capacity of consumers to buy them. It has resulted in piling up unwieldy surpluses, which farmers would not be producing but for the inducement which was given the farmers in the price-support program, which has not helped agriculture, but has called for the plowing up of millions of acres of fertile land which should have been left in grass. In the case of milk products, which, of course, have not been covered by fixed-price supports, though they have had 90-percent support, farmers have been forcing their cows to produce all the milk possible by every kind of feed process, and then, instead of selling the fluid milk, have built up a processing industry which has amassed tremendous profits at Uncle Sam's expense. I say such a program has brought disaster, and will continue to bring it, and that the confidence of the general public is being not only undermined, but destroyed. I come from a State where most of our industries are not price supported. I say, as a word of caution to my friends, and I

know they are as much interested in agriculture as I am, that the confidence of the general public in my State has been pretty largely disturbed already, and that the process will be more general if the farm program is not improved.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I believe I have 3 minutes remaining. I yield them to the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN].

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I believe I am as interested in the welfare of agriculture as is any other Senator. I am interested because I believe agriculture is the backbone of the economy of this country, but I believe that all parts of our agriculture should be equally encouraged and equally protected. I am going to vote against the Ellender amendment because it discriminates in favor of a very small segment of our agriculture and against a major part of our agriculture.

I am told that the basic commodities covered by the Ellender amendment account for only 23 percent of our agriculture. Many of the other great agricultural commodities are left unprotected or inadequately protected.

I have in mind, for instance, the great agricultural industry of my own State of New York. Dairying is the greatest income producing agricultural activity of the State of New York. I believe that in New York State, dairying accounts for about one-half the total agriculture of the State. The support price of dairy products has been drastically reduced—reduced from 90 percent of parity to 75 percent. Yet, it is now proposed that the prices the dairy industry in New York State and in other States will be required to pay for feedstuffs—for the grain and other commodities that are fed to the livestock—necessary for the production of milk will continue to be at the current high support prices. That will mean that the dairy farmers will inevitably be caught in a squeeze from which they cannot possibly escape. On the one hand, for their dairy products, they are receiving and will continue to receive, in all probability, a far lower price than the one they previously obtained. On the other hand, the prices they have to pay for the feedstuffs and other supplies which they require will remain at the current high levels. Under those circumstances, they are bound to lose, and they will inevitably suffer grievously and unfairly.

Mr. President, granted there can be worked out a program which will do justice to all the great agricultural industries of the Nation, we should not do anything to discriminate in favor of 5 or 6 of the basic commodities, as is proposed under the Ellender amendment, and by doing so, injure other great segments of our economy.

Therefore, Mr. President, I shall vote against the Ellender amendment.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield 8 minutes to the distinguished junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL].

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURKE in the chair). The Senator from Georgia is recognized.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, in my opinion, it would be nothing short of a national calamity if, either through ac-

tion by the Congress or through failure of the Congress to act, there was a failure to continue the support program of 90 percent for the basic commodities which are susceptible of control and which can be stored. It would be a catastrophe, Mr. President, not only to the farmers of the Nation, but also to our entire national economy. If the decline in farm income is carried further, it is bound to have a very bad effect on every line of business.

Mr. President, from past experience we know that our great national depressions have been farm-bred and farmed. While we may gloss over the fact that farm commodities decline in price, and while we may not immediately see that the decline affects the entire business structure of the Nation, as a matter of fact it does not take long for that slowdown of business, that affects the merchants in the small towns—the appliance dealers, the automobile dealers, and the farm equipment dealers—to affect the entire industrial structure of the Nation, and to stop the smoke from pouring from the largest smokestacks of the greatest industries in the land.

Of course, Mr. President, there is some cogency to the argument that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry has not yet reported on the agricultural commodity price-support bill. However, the fact that the pending amendment has been offered, and this issue has been raised, will not in anywise prevent the committee from making its report on legislation of this nature.

The Ellender amendment will continue the program for 1 year, and this will give the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry ample opportunity to make its report.

So, Mr. President, when we vote in favor of adoption of the amendment, we shall not be voting to impinge in any way on the prerogative of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry to report proposed legislation dealing not only with the basic agricultural commodities, but also with the other agricultural commodities which are under consideration.

Mr. President, in the Senate Chamber we hear debate as between the so-called flexible support program and the so-called rigid support program. I wish to point out that there is only one real difference between those two programs, and that is in the income that goes to the farmers of the Nation. Even if we adopt the flexible support program, there will still be the same acreage allotments that are provided by existing law.

The Secretary of Agriculture has talked about the freezes in production. Mr. President, under the flexible support program there would be exactly the same freezes in production there are now under the rigid support program. The only real difference is whether we are to guarantee the farmers at least 90 percent of a fair price for the 55 million acres of wheat and the 17.9 million acres of cotton they can plant in 1955.

I wish to say that if those who are interested in the wool bill will look beyond the doors of the Senate, they will be wise to vote for this amendment, because it will assure that proposed wool

legislation will be considered in the House of Representatives.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PAYNE in the chair). The time allotted to the Senator from Georgia has expired.

The Senator from Louisiana has 5 minutes remaining.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yielded to the Senator from Georgia all the time remaining to me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk understood the Senator from Louisiana to yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. ELLENDER. No, Mr. President; I yielded 8 minutes to the Senator from Georgia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Very well. The Senator from Georgia is recognized further.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thought that was the briefest 8 minutes I had ever spoken, but sometimes we are not aware of what we have done. [Laughter.]

Mr. President, I wish to say that in my opinion the efforts that have been made to array the consumers of this land against the farmers of the Nation, who feed and clothe them, are unworthy of the Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to protect the farmers. Not only that, but it is holding out a mirage to the consumers, for if the supports are permitted to "flex" down to 75 percent of parity, the consumers will not have been helped, but the farmers will have been destroyed; and when that is done, great harm is done to the consumers who manufacture the commodities the farmers buy.

Mr. President, the average farmer receives 2½ cents for the wheat that goes into a 1-pound loaf of bread. That loaf of bread sells throughout the Nation at an average price of 16½ cents. If the cost of that loaf of bread were to be diminished by 1 cent, it would be necessary to decrease the price of wheat by 80 cents a bushel.

Similarly, Mr. President, when there is talk of aiding the consumers, let me point out that in the case of cotton, the cotton that goes into a shirt amounts to three-quarters of a pound, and it brings a return of about 20 cents to the farmer. If the price were to be decreased 15 percent, the farmers will be bankrupt, and the consumer would be saved only 4 cents on the cost of each shirt or 4 cents on the cost of a housedress, even though the latter were to sell for \$8 or \$10.

Mr. President, who would delude themselves into thinking that even that minute benefit would ever reach the consumer? We know it would be absorbed by the processor, the baker, the miller, the shipper, and the wholesaler, and would never get down to the consumer, although such declines in income would absolutely destroy the farmer.

If tomorrow the price of cotton and wheat were to be reduced to 50 percent of parity, I venture to say there would not be any immediate reflection, in terms of decreased price, to the consumer. Any benefit the consumer did derive over a long span of months would be greatly outweighed by the disadvantage to the entire economy, by saying to the 16 per-

cent of the people who are directly dependent upon farming for a livelihood, "Your income will be brought down to standard levels."

There is talk about surpluses. Let me say we will work off the surpluses with proper application of controls.

Mr. President, suppose someone were to propose an amendment applying to a situation in which there was a great surplus of labor; suppose some person were to suggest that the way to get rid of that surplus of labor was to cut wages 15 percent. That person would be driven out of the community.

Suppose there were a great surplus of automobiles, or of any other commodity, and suppose someone undertook to pass a law which would cause that commodity to decline 15 percent in price. Such a decline would certainly wreck those who had made their investments in that industry, just as the program now proposed would wreck the farmers.

I realize that the viewpoints of all of us are affected by the commodities produced in our respective States. As a rule, Senators from States which produce the basic commodities are very much interested in the 90 percent support program. Those who have little farming and who have felt the effect of Secretary Benson's appeal to the consuming public to drive down farm prices still further may think that they are obligated to vote against this amendment.

However, the question has much broader implications than that. Let not my friends whose States do not produce basic commodities deceive themselves. We cannot cause a great break in the price of any one of the major agricultural commodities without affecting the price of every other agricultural commodity. We cannot put wheat or any other product on a toboggan slide without bringing down the price even of potatoes, lettuce, apples, or any other agricultural commodity which may be produced in this country.

Mr. President, Senators who really wish to see the wool bill enacted into law will do well to vote for the pending amendment, which will assure that it will be considered in proper committees across the Capitol and reported. Otherwise, the chances are that it would never see daylight in the other body.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LENNON in the chair). The time of the Senator from Georgia has expired.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, has all time for debate expired?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time for debate has expired.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Butler, Md.	Douglas
Anderson	Butler, Nebr.	Duff
Barrett	Carlson	Dworshak
Beall	Case	Eastland
Bennett	Chavez	Ellender
Bowring	Clements	Ferguson
Bricker	Cooper	Frear
Bridges	Cordon	Fulbright
Burke	Daniel	Gillette
Bush	Dirksen	Goldwater

Gore	Kuchel	Payne
Green	Langer	Potter
Hayden	Lehman	Purtell
Hendrickson	Lennon	Robertson
Hennings	Long	Russell
Hickenlooper	Magnuson	Saltonstall
Hill	Malone	Schoeppel
Hoey	Mansfield	Smathers
Holland	Martin	Smith, Maine
Humphrey	Maybank	Smith, N. J.
Ives	McCarran	Sparkman
Jackson	McCarthy	Stennis
Jenner	McClellan	Symington
Johnson, Colo.	Millikin	Thye
Johnson, Tex.	Monroney	Upton
Johnston, S. C.	Morse	Watkins
Kefauver	Mundt	Welker
Kerr	Murray	Williams
Kilgore	Neely	Young
Knowland	Pastore	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PAYNE in the chair). A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana on behalf of himself and other Senators.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I request the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] be added as a cosponsor of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ELLENDER. I ask unanimous consent that the amendment, as modified, be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment, as modified.

The CHIEF CLERK. The amendment, as modified, was, on page 8, after line 9, to insert the following:

Sec. 10. Section 101 (d) of the Agricultural Act of 1949 (7 U. S. C., sec. 1441 (d) (6)), as amended, is amended by striking out "1953 and 1954" and inserting in lieu thereof "1953, 1954, and 1955."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment, as modified, offered by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], for himself and other Senators. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SMATHERS (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE]. If he were present and voting he would vote "yea" and if I were permitted to vote I would vote "nay." I withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is absent on official business.

If present and voting the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] would vote "nay."

On this vote the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] has a pair with the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY]. If present and voting the Senator from Indiana would vote "nay" and the Senator from Wisconsin would vote "yea."

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] are absent on official business.

I also announce that if present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 40, nays 48, as follows:

YEAS—40		
Case	Jackson	Monroney
Chavez	Johnson, Tex.	Morse
Clements	Johnston, S. C.	Mundt
Cooper	Kefauver	Murray
Daniel	Kerr	Neely
Douglas	Kilgore	Robertson
Eastland	Langer	Russell
Ellender	Lennon	Sparkman
Fulbright	Long	Stennis
Green	Magnuson	Symington
Hennings	Mansfield	Thye
Hill	Maybank	Young
Hoey	McCarthy	
Humphrey	McClellan	

NAYS—48		
Aiken	Dworshak	Malone
Anderson	Ferguson	Martin
Barrett	Frear	McCarran
Beall	Gillette	Millikin
Bennett	Goldwater	Pastore
Bowring	Gore	Payne
Bricker	Hayden	Potter
Bridges	Hendrickson	Purtell
Burke	Hickenlooper	Saltonstall
Bush	Holland	Schoeppel
Butler, Md.	Ives	Smith, Maine
Butler, Nebr.	Jenner	Smith, N. J.
Carlson	Johnson, Colo.	Upton
Cordon	Knowland	Watkins
Dirksen	Kuchel	Welker
Duff	Lehman	Williams

NOT VOTING—8		
Byrd	George	Smathers
Caephart	Hunt	Wiley
Flanders	Kennedy	

So the amendment, as modified, offered by Mr. ELLENDER for himself and other Senators, was rejected.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] for himself and other Senators was rejected.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to lay on the table the motion of the Senator from Vermont.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. MALONE obtained the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will advise the Senate that the time is under control, and that the introduction of amendments is in order.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I call up my amendment in the nature of a substitute, which is identified as "4-23-54-B."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would inquire whether the Senator from Nevada desires that the entire amendment be read, or if he would agree to have it printed in the RECORD.

Mr. MALONE. I should like to have it printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment offered by Mr. MALONE was to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

That as used in this act the term "strategic and critical wool and mohair" means wool and mohair and any products processed therefrom, which are determined to be strategic or critical under section 2 (a) of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stockpiling Act.

SEC. 2. It is declared to be the policy of the Congress to develop and promote the production of strategic and critical wool and mohair within the United States so that such wool and mohair will be available to the Nation in time of war and to relieve the United States from dependency upon foreign areas for such strategic and critical wool and mohair, the transportation of which in time of war would be difficult or impossible. It is necessary and essential that a proper economic climate be created or exist to encourage the development and production of our strategic and critical wool and mohair. Such economic climate would enable the United States to maintain a going concern critical wool and mohair industry within the United States in time of peace which can supply the Nation with such strategic and critical wool and mohair in time of war. To create such favorable economic climate and to accomplish the other objectives of this act it will be necessary to reestablish a principle in the regulation of import duties on strategic and critical wool and mohair to provide for fair and reasonable competition between foreign producers and domestic producers.

SEC. 3. (a) There is hereby created a Strategic and Critical Wool and Mohair Authority, to be composed of the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of the Treasury, and the Chairman of the United States Tariff Commission (hereinafter referred to as the Authority), which shall have the powers conferred by this act with respect to any strategic and critical wool and mohair whenever the Authority certifies that such strategic and critical wool and mohair requires relief as authorized herein.

(b) The Authority may, subject to the civil-service laws, appoint such employees as it deems necessary to carry out its functions under this act and shall fix their compensation in accordance with the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

(c) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

SEC. 4. All powers vested in, delegated to, or otherwise properly exercisable by the President or any other officer or agency of the United States in respect to the foreign trade agreements entered into pursuant to section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, insofar as they relate to strategic and critical wool and mohair, are hereby transferred to, and shall be exercisable by the Authority, including but not limited to, the right to invoke the various escape clauses, reservations, and options therein contained, and to exercise on behalf of the United States any rights or privileges therein provided for the protection of the interests of the United States.

SEC. 5. (a) The Authority is authorized and directed from time to time, and subject to the limitations herein provided, to prescribe and establish import duties upon strategic and critical wool and mohair, which will provide for fair and reasonable competition between domestic articles and like or similar foreign articles in the principal market or markets of the United States. A foreign article shall be considered as providing fair and reasonable competition to United States producers of a like or simi-

lar article if the Authority finds as a fact that the landed duty paid price of the foreign article in the principal market or markets in the United States is a fair price, including a reasonable profit to the importers, and is not substantially below the price, including a reasonable profit for domestic producers, at which the like or similar domestic articles can be offered to consumers of the same class by the domestic industry in the principal market or markets in the United States.

(b) In determining whether the landed duty paid price of a foreign article, including a fair profit for the importers, is, and may continue to be, a fair price under subdivision (a) of this section, the Authority shall take into consideration, insofar as it finds practicable—

(1) the lowest, highest, average, and median landed duty paid price of the article from foreign countries offering substantial competition;

(2) any change that may occur or may reasonably be expected in the exchange rates of foreign countries either by reason of devaluation or because of a serious unbalance of international payments;

(3) the policy of foreign countries designed substantially to increase exports to the United States by selling at unreasonably low and uneconomic prices to secure additional dollar credits;

(4) increases or decreases of domestic production and of imports on the basis of both unit volume of articles produced and articles imported, and the respective percentages of each;

(5) the actual and potential future ratio of volume and value of imports to volume and value of production, respectively;

(6) the probable extent and duration of changes in production costs and practices; and

(7) the degree to which normal cost relationships may be affected by grants, subsidies (effected through multiple rates of export exchange, or otherwise), excises, export taxes, or other taxes, or otherwise, in the country of origin; and any other factors either in the United States or in other countries which appear likely to affect production costs and competitive relationships.

(c) Decreases or increases in import duties designed to provide for fair and reasonable competition between foreign and domestic articles may be made by the Authority either upon its own motion or upon application of any person or group showing adequate and proper interest in the import duties in question: *Provided, however*, That no change in any import duty shall be ordered by the Authority until after it shall have first conducted a full investigation and presented tentative proposals followed by a public hearing at which interested parties have an opportunity to be heard.

(d) The Authority, in setting import duties so as to establish fair and reasonable competition as herein provided, may, in order to effectuate the purposes of this act, prescribe specific duties or ad valorem rates of duty upon the foreign value or export value as defined in sections 402 (c) and 402 (d) of the Tariff Act of 1930 or upon the United States value as defined in section 402 (e) of said act.

(e) In order to carry out the purposes of this act, the Authority is authorized to transfer any article from the dutiable list to the free list, or from the free list to the dutiable list.

(f) Any increase or decrease in import duties ordered by the Authority shall become effective 90 days after such order is announced: *Provided*, That any such order is first submitted to Congress by the Authority and is not disapproved, in whole or in part, by concurrent resolution of Congress within 60 days thereafter.

(g) No order shall be announced by the Authority under this section which increases existing import duties on foreign articles if the Authority finds as a fact that the domestic industry operates, or the domestic article is produced, in a wasteful, inefficient, or extravagant manner.

(h) The Authority, in the manner provided for in subdivisions (c) and (f) in this section, may impose quantitative limits on the importation of any foreign article, in such amounts, and for such periods, as it finds necessary in order to effectuate the purposes of this act: *Provided, however*, That no such quantitative limits shall be imposed contrary to the provisions of any foreign trade agreement in effect pursuant to section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930.

(i) For the purpose of this section—

(1) The term "domestic article" means an article wholly or in part the growth or product of the United States; and the term "foreign article" means an article wholly or in part the growth or product of a foreign country.

(2) The term "United States" includes the several States and Territories and the District of Columbia.

(3) The term "foreign country" means any empire, country, dominion, colony, or protectorate, or any subdivision or subdivisions thereof (other than the United States and its possessions).

(4) The term "landed duty paid price" means the price of any foreign article after payment of the applicable customs or import duties and other necessary charges, as represented by the acquisition cost to an importing consumer, dealer, retailer, or manufacturer, or the offering price to a consumer, dealer, retailer, or manufacturer, if imported by an agent.

(j) The Authority is authorized to make all needful rules and regulations for carrying out its functions under the provisions of this section.

(k) The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to make such rules and regulations as he may deem necessary for the entry and declaration of foreign articles with respect to which a change in basis of value has been made under the provisions of subdivision (d) of this section, and for the form of invoice required at time of entry.

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill to encourage and assist the production of strategic and critical wool and mohair in the United States, and for other purposes."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from Nevada advise the Chair how much time he yields himself?

Mr. MALONE. I yield myself the full time.

SUBSIDIES VERSUS TARIFFS OR DUTIES—U. S. PRODUCERS WANT EQUAL ACCESS TO U. S. MARKETS

Mr. President, all that the wool-growers of this country have ever asked is to have access to their own market. Under the 1934 Trade Agreements Act—the so-called Reciprocal Trade Act—the State Department traded the wool markets of the United States to Australia, New Zealand, South Africa, Uruguay, and Argentina, among others, in a trade agreement dated January 1, 1948.

Then under the "most favored nation" clause, all of the nations of the world, regardless of their lower wage standards of living, and the difference in taxes and costs of doing business, can export their wool to the American market and displace the American producer.

Mr. President, paying taxpayers' money to the woolproducers as a subsidy is not the answer.

Senate bill 2911 is offered in the nature of a substitute—and if passed and the President served 6 months notice of cancellation of this so-called trade agreement—then the Tariff Commission, as an agent of Congress, takes over and adjusts the duty or tariffs on the basis of fair and reasonable competition.

In 1930 the tariff on wool was 77 percent, which was about the differential in the cost of raising a "sheep unit," a ewe and lamb, in Australia and in this Nation.

#### MONEY MANIPULATION FOR TRADE ADVANTAGE

With the devaluation of the pound 30 percent, from \$4.03 to \$2.80; with the actual lowering of our tariff 25 percent through the trade agreements with a group of low-wage standard of living nations; and with inflation amounting to a decrease of 50 percent in the purchasing power of our own money, the tariff protection now amounts to about 21 percent.

The cost of raising a sheep unit in Australia is still just 25 percent of the cost of raising the same unit in the United States.

The foreign nations with which we deal understand the manipulation of their currency for trade advantage and other factors to promote their sales abroad; while, obviously, our State Department does not know what it is doing; or if it does know, it is deliberately selling the workingman and the small investor down the river for a fancied world political advantage which obviously they do not get.

#### RESOLUTION OF NATIONAL WOOL GROWERS ASSOCIATION

Mr. President, the National Wool Growers Association, at their national convention on December 14, 1953, adopted the following resolution:

We wish to reaffirm the historical and traditional position of the National Wool Growers Association that an adequate tariff on wool is the proper way to safeguard the sheep industry of the United States.

The promotion of world trade should be on the basis of fair and reasonable competition and must be done within the principle long maintained that foreign products of underpaid foreign labor shall not be admitted to the country on terms which endanger the living standards of the American workingman or the American farmer, or threaten serious injury to a domestic industry.

The United States Congress is urged to resume its constitutional responsibility of regulating foreign commerce through the adjustment on duties, imposts, and excises through its agent, the Tariff Commission, and allow the 1934 Trade Agreements Act, the so-called Reciprocal Trade Act, which transferred such responsibility to the President, to expire in June of 1954.

#### THE NEW ENGLAND TEXTILE COMMITTEE

Mr. President, on April 7, 1954, the New England Textile Committee report on the subject of tariffs included the following recommendations:

1. That there should be no further reductions in tariff rates on any of the different classes of textiles.

2. That tariff rates should be raised on textile products where foreign imports cause or threaten to cause unemployment in any segment of the industry.

#### EIGHTY DEPRESSED LABOR AREAS—IMPORTS

Mr. President, in my address to the Senate on March 31 of this year I pointed out 80 depressed labor areas in the United States, which included 27 States, together with the specific imports causing the unemployment.

#### COAL AND PETROLEUM

Yesterday, Mr. President, 16 governors of this Nation met at a luncheon and discussed the plight of the domestic coal industry. The domestic petroleum industry likewise is faced with the same plight, as are many other industries, including the mining industry, the watch industry, the crockery industry, the machine tool industry, and several hundred other industries. What is the reason for this, Mr. President?

It is simply the result of importing the products of low-cost, sweatshop, or peon labor in direct competition with our own production. That is the common problem. Wool comes in under the State Department's trade agreement with Australia, New Zealand, South Africa, Uruguay, Argentina, and other nations, selling for what the traffic will bear, the record will show, leaving the American-produced wool to be purchased under the price support arrangement and stored for future reference.

The foreign wool is imported into the United States without any duty, tariff, or differential to equalize the differences between wages and taxes in the United States and the lower wages and taxes in the chief competing foreign nations.

#### SUBSTITUTE TARIFF FOR SUBSIDY

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record my amendment in the nature of a substitute.

There being no objection, the amendment in the nature of a substitute was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

That as used in this act the term "strategic and critical wool and mohair" means wool and mohair and any products processed therefrom, which are determined to be strategic or critical under section 2 (a) of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stockpiling Act.

SEC. 2. It is declared to be the policy of the Congress to develop and promote the production of strategic and critical wool and mohair within the United States so that such wool and mohair will be available to the Nation in time of war and to relieve the United States from dependency upon foreign areas for such strategic and critical wool and mohair, the transportation of which in time of war would be difficult or impossible. It is necessary and essential that a proper economic climate be created or exist to encourage the development and production of our strategic and critical wool and mohair. Such economic climate would enable the United States to maintain a going concern critical wool and mohair industry within the United States in time of peace which can supply the Nation with such strategic and critical wool and mohair in time of war. To create such favorable economic climate and to accomplish the other objectives of this act it will be necessary to reestablish a principle in the regulation of import duties on strategic and critical wool and mohair to provide for fair and reasonable competition between foreign producers and domestic producers.

SEC. 3. (a) There is hereby created a Strategic and Critical Wool and Mohair Authority, to be composed of the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of the Treasury, and the Chairman of the United States Tariff Commission (hereinafter referred to as the Authority), which shall have the powers conferred by this act with respect to any strategic and critical wool and mohair whenever the Authority certifies that such strategic and critical wool and mohair requires relief as authorized herein.

(b) The Authority may, subject to the civil-service laws, appoint such employees as it deems necessary to carry out its functions under this act and shall fix their compensation in accordance with the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

(c) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

SEC. 4. All powers vested in, delegated to, or otherwise properly exercisable by the President or any other officer or agency of the United States in respect to the foreign trade agreements entered into pursuant to section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, insofar as they relate to strategic and critical wool and mohair, are hereby transferred to, and shall be exercisable by the Authority, including but not limited to, the right to invoke the various escape clauses, reservations, and options therein contained, and to exercise on behalf of the United States any rights or privileges therein provided for the protection of the interests of the United States.

SEC. 5. (a) The Authority is authorized and directed from time to time, and subject to the limitations herein provided, to prescribe and establish import duties upon strategic and critical wool and mohair, which will provide for fair and reasonable competition between domestic articles and like or similar foreign articles in the principal market or markets of the United States. A foreign article shall be considered as providing fair and reasonable competition to United States producers of a like or similar article if the Authority finds as a fact that the landed duty paid price of the foreign article in the principal market or markets in the United States is a fair price, including a reasonable profit to the importers, and is not substantially below the price, including a reasonable profit for domestic producers, at which the like or similar domestic articles can be offered to consumers of the same class by the domestic industry in the principal market or markets in the United States.

(b) In determining whether the landed duty paid price of a foreign article, including a fair profit for the importers, is, and may continue to be, a fair price under subdivision (a) of this section, the Authority shall take into consideration, insofar as it finds practicable—

(1) the lowest, highest, average, and median landed duty fair price of the article from foreign countries offering substantial competition;

(2) any change that may occur or may reasonably be expected in the exchange rates of foreign countries either by reason of devaluation or because of a serious unbalance of international payments;

(3) the policy of foreign countries designed substantially to increase exports to the United States by selling at unreasonably low and uneconomic prices to secure additional dollar credits;

(4) increases or decreases of domestic production and of imports on the basis of both unit volume of articles produced and articles imported, and the respective percentages of each;

(5) the actual and potential future ration of volume and value of imports to volume and value of production, respectively;

(6) the probable extent and duration of changes in production costs and practices; and

(7) the degree to which normal cost relationships may be affected by grants, subsidies (effected through multiple rates of export exchange, or otherwise), excises, export taxes, or other taxes, or otherwise, in the country of origin; and any other factors either in the United States or in other countries which appear likely to affect production costs and competitive relationships.

(c) Decreases or increases in import duties designed to provide for fair and reasonable competition between foreign and domestic articles may be made by the Authority either upon its own motion or upon application of any person or group showing adequate and proper interest in the import duties in question: *Provided, however*, That no change in any import duty shall be ordered by the Authority until after it shall have first conducted a full investigation and presented tentative proposals followed by a public hearing at which interested parties have an opportunity to be heard.

(d) The Authority, in setting import duties so as to establish fair and reasonable competition as herein provided, may, in order to effectuate the purposes of this act, prescribe specific duties or ad valorem rates of duty upon the foreign value or export value as defined in sections 402 (c) and 402 (d) of the Tariff Act of 1930 or upon the United States value as defined in section 402 (e) of said act.

(e) In order to carry out the purposes of this act, the Authority is authorized to transfer any article from the dutiable list to the free list, or from the free list to the dutiable list.

(f) Any increase or decrease in import duties ordered by the Authority shall become effective 90 days after such order is announced: *Provided*, That any such order is first submitted to Congress by the Authority and is not disapproved, in whole or in part, by concurrent resolution of Congress within 60 days thereafter.

(g) No order shall be announced by the Authority under this section which increases existing import duties on foreign articles if the Authority finds as a fact that the domestic industry operates, or the domestic article is produced, in a wasteful, inefficient, or extravagant manner.

(h) The Authority, in the manner provided for in subdivisions (c) and (f) in this section, may impose quantitative limits on the importation of any foreign article, in such amounts, and for such periods, as it finds necessary in order to effectuate the purposes of this act: *Provided, however*, That no such quantitative limit shall be imposed contrary to the provisions of any foreign trade agreement in effect pursuant to section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930.

(i) For the purpose of this section—

(1) The term "domestic article" means an article wholly or in part the growth or product of the United States; and the term "foreign article" means an article wholly or in part the growth or product of a foreign country.

(2) The term "United States" includes the several States and Territories and the District of Columbia.

(3) The term "foreign country" means any empire, country, dominion, colony, or protectorate, or any subdivision or subdivisions thereof (other than the United States and its possessions).

(4) The term "landed duty paid price" means the price of any foreign article after payment of the applicable customs or import duties and other necessary charges, as represented by the acquisition cost to an importing consumer, dealer, retailer, or manufacturer, or the offering price to a consumer, dealer, retailer, or manufacturer, if imported by an agent.

(j) The Authority is authorized to make all needful rules and regulations for carrying out its functions under the provisions of this section.

(k) The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to make such rules and regulations as he may deem necessary for the entry and declaration of foreign articles with respect to which a change in basis of value has been made under the provisions of subdivision (d) of this section, and for the form of invoice required at time of entry.

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill to encourage and assist the production of strategic and critical wool and mohair in the United States, and for other purposes."

#### AMENDMENT MEETS RESOLUTION OBJECTIVE

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, my amendment in the nature of a substitute for S. 2911 will do exactly what the resolution I have read asks to have done.

It will give to our own producers equal access to their own markets in the United States. The tariff, or the duty, as the Constitution calls it, would be regulated on the basis of fair and reasonable competition and would equalize the differential in cost of production between this Nation and the chief competitive nation.

#### TAKE THE PROFIT OUT OF PEON LABOR

A flexible duty or a tariff adjusted by the Tariff Commission on the basis of fair and reasonable competition simply takes the profit out of peon and sweatshop labor, and the money is paid into the United States Treasury, where it can be used to lower taxes or to apply on the national debt.

A subsidy is new money, and requires additional taxes to be collected to pay to the American producers while the cheap, foreign-labor-produced wool piles up in the warehouses of the Nation.

#### AN OXYGEN TENT OVER EXPIRING INDUSTRY

The National Wool Growers Association is accepting the subsidy proposal as an oxygen tent placed over an expiring industry, because they have been informed that no adjustment of the duty or tariff will be allowed, even though the Tariff Commission has recommended that the tariff be increased to make up the difference in the standard of living production costs here and abroad.

The wool producers of the Nation are accepting the subsidy, which the junior Senator from Nevada will vote for if his amendment in the nature of a substitute is not accepted, because it is a life raft to keep them afloat until they can get equal access to their own American market through a flexible import fee, tariff, or duty, as the Constitution calls it, adjusted on the basis of fair and reasonable competition.

The State Department has traded the American market from under them—and there is no evidence that they know where the sheep are raised in the United States.

#### TARIFF ON BASIS OF FAIR AND REASONABLE COMPETITION

The woolgrowers of the Nation have fought, and still are fighting, for a just and adequate tariff—not a high tariff, not a low tariff, but a flexible tariff, or a duty, which will reflect the difference in the cost of production based upon the American standard of living wages and the standard of living wages of the chief

competing foreign wool-producing nation.

That fight, so far, has been in vain, and we have lost almost one-half of the American production of this essential and critical material of war, and of our peacetime economy, as well.

The measure as introduced is no real solution to the problem, but if the administration's present thinking is to prevail, it would be the only way in which the Nation's wool industry could survive.

That is why the woolgrowers have felt constrained to accept the subsidy program, because Congress, up to this point, has shown no inclination to accept its responsibility and to reassert its constitutional authority to set the tariff structure of the Nation on the basis of the need of our domestic economy.

#### FATE OF AN INDUSTRY IN THE HANDS OF A BUREAU

Mr. President, I feel that such a measure as S. 2991, introduced as a direct-payment program, is entirely inadequate. To my mind, this bill, like so many of the laws Congress has passed during the last two decades, places the fate of an industry in the hands of a bureau official. No private investors will enter a business under these conditions.

The real solution to the wool program would be easily found by allowing the 1934 Trade Agreements Act to expire at midnight on June 12 and Congress reassume its constitutional responsibility of regulating and adjusting the duties, imposts, and excises through the Tariff Commission which is an agent of Congress.

#### PROBABLY UNCONSTITUTIONAL

Mr. President, on June 12 of this year, at midnight, the 1934 Trade Agreements Act expires, if it is not renewed by the Congress of the United States. That act, which was passed in 1934 for 3 years, has been renewed periodically.

Last year it was renewed for 1 year. It simply transfers to the executive branch of the Government the constitutional responsibility of Congress to regulate the duties, imposts, and excises, and to regulate foreign commerce. It changes the Constitution of the United States without referring it to the States.

Article 1, section 8, of the Constitution, places such responsibility in the legislative branch. As everyone knows, the Constitution also places the responsibility of fixing of foreign policy in the hands of the Executive. The Constitution pointedly separates the regulation of the domestic economy and the fixing of foreign policy. It pointedly separates the regulation of the domestic economy, and the fixing of the foreign. The 1934 Trade Agreements Act—so-called reciprocal trade—changed the Constitution by a mere act of Congress and is believed by many to be unconstitutional.

#### ACHESON-THORP-DULLES

It will be remembered that Mr. Acheson and Mr. Thorp testified before committees many times that it is impossible for them to separate the domestic economy from the foreign policy.

Of course, it was impossible so long as the 1934 Trade Agreements Act remained

in effect. Mr. President, it was well recognized that Mr. Acheson and Mr. Thorp were economic "one worlders"; we hoped that Mr. Dulles would abide by the Constitution.

#### REGULATING IMPORTS

The permanent solution can only be reached through the proper handling of wool imports.

Those imports, products of underpaid foreign labor, are flooding our markets at the expense of domestic producers, and will continue under the proposed legislation embodied in S. 2911 as reported by the Committee on Agriculture.

The only way to permanently rectify the now acute wool situation is to enact the proposed amendment of the junior Senator from Nevada, and to allow the 1934 Trade Agreements Act to expire on June 12 of this year. There will then be put into effect the regulation of foreign trade through the adjustment of the flexible duty or tariff reverts to the Tariff Commission, as an agent of Congress, to be regulated on the basis of fair and reasonable competition. This would give foreign nations equal access to our markets, but no advantage.

If the 1934 Trade Agreements Act is allowed to expire on June 12 of this year, immediately the regulation of foreign trade and the fixing of duties, imposts, and excises that we call tariffs will revert to the Tariff Commission, which is an agent of Congress. The trade agreements already entered into will remain in full force and effect until the President of the United States shall serve 6 months' notice of cancellation on the country or countries with which such agreement has been made, which he can do immediately.

#### STATE DEPARTMENT CAN TRADE ANY INDUSTRY

As matters now stand, foreign trade is handled by the State Department, which can trade a part or all of any industry to foreign nations for a fancied political advantage. They do not really make trade agreements; they make agreements to lower tariffs or duties without realizing the damage they do to American industries, including the wool, textiles, minerals, and hundreds of other industries.

When Congress passed the Trade Agreements Act in 1934, it tied the domestic economy to the foreign policy, with administration under the Secretary of State.

The Constitution pointedly separates domestic economy and foreign policy, and places the former under administration of the legislative branch and the latter under the executive.

#### THE AGRICULTURAL BILL

Mr. President, let me cite an example of that situation which had its climax only last month. It started last July, when this body was busy considering the 1-year extension of that Trade Agreements Act. An amendment was proposed to make mandatory what the Congress intended when it passed section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act. That is the section which provides that the Tariff Commission will make a study when imports coming into this country

not only hurt an industry, but hurt the Government support program, which is financed by the taxpayers.

We were assured on the floor of the Senate that there was no need to make the rulings of the Tariff Commission mandatory on the President; that he was aware of the needs of the wool industry. It was the junior Senator from Colorado, I believe, who gave assurances that a new section 22 hearing would be held with the idea of protecting the domestic wool industry's support program. It was the senior Senator from Oregon who proposed a substitute amendment to the mandatory one, and whose amendment was adopted because the Senator assured us that this administration was different, that it would act.

The representatives of industry and the Department of Agriculture went before the Tariff Commission and presented their case. Apparently it was a good one, because the Tariff Commission recommended an additional import fee of 10 cents a clean pound on all foreign wool.

Just for the record, Mr. President, according to the Tariff Commission, that 10 cents a pound increase was just enough to protect the Government in its support program. It was not intended to be enough to help the industry out of its problems of "foreign competition." It would just permit the Government to support the price of wool at the present low support level, without the Government having to buy up the American wool while the foreign wool took the American market.

#### STATE DEPARTMENT ANNOUNCED RESULT

Even before they knew the Tariff Commission's exact recommendations, the wool industry expressed pleasure that now this administration was going to act on the import competition problem in some small measure.

Ray W. Willoughby, of San Angelo, Tex., president of the National Wool Growers Association, issued a formal statement as to how his organization felt about the matter. This statement was issued on February 19, while this very wool bill the Senate is debating was being studied by the Committee on Agriculture. I want to read this statement, for it is an integral part of these developments.

I now quote Mr. Willoughby:

The woolgrowers are most gratified that the United States Tariff Commission has taken action on the application for increased import fees under section 22 of the Agricultural Act, in order to protect the support program of the Government.

Naturally we do not know the Commission's recommendations to the President but we are most hopeful that they are favorable to an increased fee of sufficient amount to protect the Government-support program for the disposition of the wool stockpile now owned by the Government and under loan in the 1953 program.

We shall request the President to take immediate action on this matter and impose additional import fees for the protection of the present support program.

Only this morning, the Department of Agriculture, in seeking another support program, testified before the Senate Agriculture Committee that wool has not been

protected sufficiently by tariff rates to permit the loan program to work.

I was testifying as to the plight of the industry at the moment the chairman of the committee announced the Commission decision had gone to the White House.

Regardless of the pending legislation now before the Congress to change the method of supporting wool, which we have endorsed, these facts are apparent and important in showing the need for immediate imposition of additional import fees on foreign wool:

1. The old-support program is in effect and is not working.

2. The President has announced the need for a strong domestic wool industry for essential defense needs of the Nation.

3. Even if a new support or incentive program is adopted by the Congress, the industry would have to suffer through many more months of present market conditions and the depressing effect on prices until the disposal of the present Government stockpile and the wool acquired under the 1953 program.

#### PRESIDENT REFUSED TO ACT

That statement was made on February 19, and on March 5 of this year, the woolgrowers of Nevada and the rest of the Nation picked up their newspapers to read that the administration again had refused to help the American producer.

Mr. President, I have in my hand a clipping from the Reno Evening Gazette published in Reno, Nev., the headline of which reads: "Wool Tariff Boost Proposal Is Laid Aside." It was an Associated Press story from Washington, and the first paragraph reads:

President Eisenhower has shelved a Tariff Commission report calling for imposition of certain fees on wool imports in addition to prevailing duties. He urged that Congress approve the administration's incentive plan instead.

I ask unanimous consent that the full article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### WOOL TARIFF BOOST PROPOSAL IS LAID ASIDE

WASHINGTON, March 5.—President Eisenhower has shelved a Tariff Commission report calling for imposition of certain fees on wool imports in addition to prevailing duties. He urged that Congress approve the administration's incentive plan instead.

"In view of the fact that the administration's new wool program is specifically designed to remedy those conditions which prompted the Tariff Commission's investigation, I am taking no action on the Commission's report," the President said in a statement.

Eisenhower noted that the Senate Agriculture Committee has held hearings on the administration's wool program, and has approved a bill to put it in effect.

Eisenhower recalled that last July, he asked the Tariff Commission to make an investigation to determine the effect of imports of certain varieties of sheep's wool on operation of the domestic price support program for wool.

"I now have the report of the Tariff Commission, in which a majority of its members recommend the imposition of certain fees on imports of wool in addition to the prevailing duties," the President said.

He also noted that he asked Secretary of Agriculture Benson last July to make a comprehensive study of the domestic factors "which have contributed to the decline in sheep numbers and wool production in the

United States, with a view toward the development of a sound and prosperous domestic wool industry consistent with an expanding international trade."

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, on the same day, and even before the President announced his decision here, the Secretary of State announced at the conference in Caracas, Venezuela, that the President would not permit the Tariff Commission recommendations to go into effect. Let us remember that the State Department was announcing this in Venezuela at the very time when an Assistant Secretary of Agriculture was testifying about the need for the import fees. The State Department is still all powerful in its protection of the foreign producer at the expense of the American producer and worker.

So it is no wonder that I have received letters such as the following from Chandler B. Church, of Elko, Nev., president of the Nevada Wool Growers Association:

Our sheep industry badly needs some help. This administration-supported bill seems its only present chance, and all of us out this way are hoping you can help us by using your best efforts to get the leaders of the Senate and of the Senate committees concerned to push the bill through as soon as possible without having crippling amendments tacked on to it. We will surely appreciate anything you can do to get the bill, free from harmful amendments, to a vote and then help to pass it.

#### SUBSIDY A LIFE RAFT TO KEEP AFLOAT

Mr. President, this bill is the life raft the wool producers need to keep them afloat until we can make some sense out of the whole import program upon which the administration has embarked, following the preceding administration.

Such actions by the State Department, which have been largely responsible for the decline in wool production in this country, can explain the reason why the wool industry endorsed Senate bill 2911. The National Wool Growers' Association put the matter quite bluntly in a statement issued after a meeting here in Washington. They said:

This endorsement of the President's wool program was not quickly or easily arrived at, because the industry believes that any long-range solution to the problem created by the 50-percent decline in production over the past decade must of necessity be found in a fair and equitable tariff to protect both producers and workers of the United States against unfair competition from countries which do not have the standards of living and wage levels of this country.

We call to the attention of the public that the Government-owned wool stockpile of today is one which the woolgrowers have long felt unnecessary because we produce less than one-third of the wool used in the United States. But previous support programs, patterned upon the same principles as those of the farm commodities produced in surplus, have created the paradox of a deficiency crop piling up in Government hands while foreign wool took our domestic markets under the present tariff rates, with the American taxpayer footing the bill for storage and losses. We have constantly, and still do, oppose such support methods.

The National Wool Growers' Association, in endorsing this administration's wool program, reaffirms its position that it will work for a national foreign trade policy which will make it unnecessary for either the wool-

growing industry or any other domestic producing group to depend upon the Government rather than the free markets of the United States for its income. This endorsement does not mean that the program is being sought by the industry as a substitute for fair and equitable tariff, but as a substitute for a support program which has both cost the taxpayers money and completely failed in its objective of assisting our segment of agriculture.

Mr. President, the inability to get tariff protection, although even under the Trade Agreements Act they are entitled to it, makes it understandable why our people in Nevada feel that now even the Congress is refusing to consider their status as part of the United States economy when we delay and debate many other subjects besides wool, while supposedly we are considering this wool bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The 30 minutes available to the Senator from Nevada have expired.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD certain letters, telegrams, press dispatches, and pertinent data and explanations.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF NEVADA,  
EXECUTIVE CHAMBER,  
Carson City, March 30, 1954.

HON. GEORGE W. MALONE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR GEORGE: I know that you will be interested to know that the sheep and wool industry of our State will be, in my estimation, in a precarious condition unless steps are taken, immediately, in the Congress to provide necessary assistance.

There is pending in the Senate a bill S. 2911, which I feel should be acted upon promptly and favorably.

I feel, too, that any action which would provide adequate tariff protection to prevent the dumping of foreign-grown wool on the markets of the United States to the detriment of the industry should receive immediate and favorable attention, as should any and all programs designed to aid the sheep and wool men of the State.

I, personally, and all of the sheep and wool men of Nevada, will appreciate deeply your interest and support of measures designed to assist them in the precarious position in which they find themselves.

With every best personal wish,  
Sincerely yours,

CHARLES H. RUSSELL, Governor.

EUREKA, Nev., March 27, 1954.

HON. GEORGE MALONE,  
Senator of State of Nevada,  
Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I am writing you concerning bill S. 2911, the wool bill.

We sheepmen in this area feel that some of our Senators must be bogging down our wool bill that is so important to us.

We need supports and your way is the only way we can get it. We feel you can help us by getting the bill out of the rut and rolling. In a matter of a couple of weeks everyone in this area will be shearing and around that time everyone sells their wool. If fast action isn't taken, it will probably mean the difference between profit and loss to the sheepmen.

We are backing the National Wool Growers Association.

Your assistance in getting action on S. 2911 will be appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

PETE ETCHWERRY.

ELKO, NEV., April 4, 1954.

HON. GEORGE MALONE,  
Senator from Nevada, Senate Office  
Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MALONE: It has come to my attention that Senate bill S. 2911 has been bogged down somewhere along the line; and we who are producing wool are asking if it is not possible to get the leaders on the Senate Agriculture Committee to bring this to a rapid vote in a form that will be acceptable to the President.

We understand that various other interests have tied amendments onto the original wool bill, which have caused it to be sidetracked.

I am sure that any help you may be able to render will be appreciated by all of the sheepmen in our State. With kind personal regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

C. A. SEWELL.

ELKO, NEV., March 26, 1954.

GEORGE MALONE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.:

The wool industry is one of the most important industries in the State of Nevada and that on the prosperity of the industry not a negligible part of Nevada's prosperity depends. We urgently ask you to do your utmost to get the bill out of committee and on the floor for consideration.

AUXILIARY TO THE NEVADA WOOL  
GROWERS ASSOCIATION.

BATTLE MOUNTAIN, NEV., March 26, 1954.

Senator GEORGE MALONE:

Will you contact party leaders in Senate on Senate Agricultural Committee in an effort to bring bill S. 2911 to a rapid vote. Ask them to fight and work for the passage of the wool bill in a form that President will accept and sign. Kindest regards.

LOUISE JEMKINS MARVEL.

ELKO, NEV., March 24, 1954.

Senator GEORGE MALONE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.:

We feel S. 2911 being needlessly held up from Senate vote by Senators seeking amendments not related to wool. Request you try force early vote in Senate on present bill or in form acceptable to the President. Wool industry not comparable to other agricultural products.

JESS GOICOECHEA,  
President, Eastern Wool Growers.

ELKO, NEV., March 26, 1954.

GEORGE MALONE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.:

Can you help us with S. 2911 which has apparently struck snag. Our wool industry situation gets worse and worse. Can we depend on you for assistance.

EASTERN NEVADA WOOL GROWERS  
AUXILIARY.

YERINGTON, NEV., April 1, 1954.

HON. GEORGE W. MALONE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.:

Lyon County Republican Central Committee requests you do all in your power to effect passage of wool bill in form President approves.

F. H. KOEHLER,  
Secretary Lyon County Republican  
Central Committee.

RENO, NEV., March 24, 1954.

HON. GEORGE W. MALONE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.:

Understand various interests holding up wool bill, S. 2911, in Senate trying to attach harmful amendments which administration

cannot accept. This legislation badly needed for survival western sheep industry. Urge you lend every effort with Senate and committee leaders to bring this bill to rapid vote with your support in form the President can accept and sign. Would appreciate advice on outlook and anything more we can do here to help.

WM. H. MOFFAT.

ELKO, NEV., March 26, 1954.

HON. GEORGE W. MALONE,  
United States Senate,  
Washington, D. C.:

Am advised that bill S. 2911 is being held up. Would appreciate your efforts on behalf of Nevada sheepmen to get decisive and favorable action on this bill. Sheepmen feel industry needs immediate action. Thank you.

CELSO MADARIETA.

RENO, NEV., March 25, 1954.

GEORGE W. MALONE,  
United States Senate,  
Washington, D. C.:

Know your interest in sheepmen of this State will result in your full support of passage of wool bill in form which the President will approve. There must be support price for wool since administration apparently wishes not to consider tariff against importation of wool from friendly nations such as Australia and New Zealand. Will you contact leaders in Senate Agricultural Committee in effort to obtain prompt vote on wool bill which appears to be bogged down in both Houses of Congress. Ask you every effort for passage of wool bill.

E. J. QESTA,

President, First National Bank of Nevada.

ELY, NEV., March 9, 1954.

HON. GEORGE MALONE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.:

We understand the administration's wool bill, Senate bill 2911, has been reported favorably out of the Senate Agriculture Committee. We feel the enactment of this bill into law will materially help the wool growing industry. We feel that the provision should be included in this piece of legislation making it mandatory on the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out the intent and purposes of the law. We will appreciate it very much if you will help in every way to get this important piece of legislation into law.

Best personal regards,

UNITED STOCKMEN'S ASSOCIATION,  
GEORGE N. SWALLOW, Secretary.

ELY, NEV., March 9, 1954.

HON. GEORGE MALONE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.:

We understand the administration's wool program provides that the wool growers will receive about 105 percent of the present parity. We feel that this legislation as now proposed will be to the advantages of the wool growers. However, we strongly urge that parity as used in this piece of legislation be computed on a properly revised formula. Also that provisions of Senate bill No. 2911 not be left to the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture but be made mandatory.

NEVADA WOOL GROWERS ASSOCIATION,  
B. H. ROBINSON, Vice President.

SUPPORTING DATA

With inadequate tariff safeguards, the present wool support program is a recognized failure in the preservation of a sheep industry in the United States. The loan program has provided no incentive for improved or increased production. It is cum-

bersome, costly to the Government, and has created an unnecessary stockpile which is now overhanging the industry. It has resulted in the Government control of grading, prices, and marketing practices through decisions as to when and at what prices to sell the Government-owned wool. American wool has been taken off the market and has been replaced by foreign wool. This has created a floor under the prices for wool produced in other countries and it has failed to properly help the American grower.

Continuing imports of wool and increasing imports of wool textiles, at insufficient tariff rates, have destroyed the price structure for the domestic grower in the domestic market. This import competition from low wage foreign countries has caused a decline in sheep population in the United States from over 46 million in 1940 to less than 27 million in 1954.

While our wool production was declining in the United States, wool consumption was increasing tremendously. Attempts by American producers, to solve other problems of production have been to no avail in face of this importation of foreign wool at prices below the American cost of production. As a result, more than 40 percent of our wool producing ewes have been sent to the slaughter house.

This shows that the present support program has been incapable of aiding the industry on any basis which would permit a price recovery. Instead, it has, in effect, placed a ceiling on the price of wool because the Government owns a stockpile of some 100 million pounds. That stockpile is hanging over our market.

Let's look at the record on this decline of sheep production in the United States. I have here a table of the number of stock sheep and lambs on farms and ranches from 1867 to 1953 and the picture it makes is an ugly one when you realize it is the responsibility of this Congress to regulate foreign commerce. It was a rising tide of uncontrolled imports of cheap labor produced foreign wools, for instance, that caused this most drastic decline in sheep numbers. In 1942, when we needed this critical production of wool for the war, we had a healthy wool industry with 49 million head of stock sheep and lambs. By 1954 we had only 27 million head left.

Number of stock sheep and lambs on farms and ranches in the 13 range sheep States and the native sheep States, and number of sheep and lambs on feed, United States, selected peak and low years 1867-1939 and annually 1940-53<sup>1</sup>

Year	[In thousands]			
	Number of stock sheep and lambs			Sheep and lambs on feed, United States
	13 range States	Native States	United States	
1867	7,411	37,586	44,997	
1871	9,565	24,498	34,063	
1884	24,526	26,875	51,401	
1897	23,488	15,403	38,891	
1909	31,131	15,967	47,098	3,685
1925	22,519	9,787	32,307	4,206
1934	34,060	14,184	48,244	5,259
1937	31,640	13,611	45,251	5,597
1939	31,811	13,625	45,436	5,855
1940	32,162	14,104	46,266	5,841
1941	33,016	14,425	47,441	6,479
1942	34,444	14,902	49,346	6,867
1943	33,537	14,659	48,196	6,954
1944	31,177	13,093	44,270	6,512
1945	28,241	11,368	39,609	6,911
1946	25,536	9,989	35,525	6,837
1947	22,656	9,149	31,805	5,993
1948	21,091	8,395	29,486	4,851
1949	19,335	7,605	26,940	4,003
1950	18,753	7,429	26,182	3,644

<sup>1</sup> The 13 range sheep States include Montana, Idaho, Wyoming, Colorado, New Mexico, Arizona, Utah, Nevada, Washington, Oregon, California, Texas, and South Dakota. The native States are all other States, where sheep generally are raised under farm conditions.

Number of stock sheep and lambs on farms and ranches in the 13 range sheep States and the native sheep States, and number of sheep and lambs on feed, United States, selected peak and low years 1867-1939 and annually 1940-53—Continued

Year	Number of stock sheep and lambs			Sheep and lambs on feed, United States	All sheep and lambs, United States
	13 range States	Native States	United States		
	1951	19,414	7,839	27,253	3,382
1952	19,524	8,526	28,050	4,038	32,088
1953	19,030	8,827	27,857	3,754	31,611

NOTE.—The decline in sheep numbers from 1942 to 1950 was the most drastic in history. Sheep numbers increased slightly during 1950 and 1951, but they declined again in 1952 and 1953 and now are at a near record low level. Our wool production has varied with sheep numbers. Over 70 percent of our shorn wool is produced in the 13 western range States, including Texas and South Dakota. Sheep numbers in those States have declined 45 percent since 1942, and in the rest of the country 41 percent.

In direct relationship with the foregoing table are three other tables which tell this story very vividly and which I think should be brought to the attention of the Senators considering this legislation. The first of these shows the number of grazing units of livestock on farms and ranches in comparison with the number permitted on the national forests. Here again is an example of how Government control by bureaucratic order rather than by rules and regulations laid down by the Congress can injure an industry. Just check these figures that show where in 1942, 948,000 grazing units of sheep were permitted on our forest lands, by 1953 that had been cut to 598,000 grazing units. And for all livestock the number of grazing units permitted had dropped from 2,137,000 units down to 1,667,000 grazing units in 1952. To be sure you understand this, it takes 5 sheep or 1 cow to equal a grazing unit.

The second table shows the number of sheep shorn in all of the United States from 1909 until 1945 and in the Western States clear up through 1953. The third chart shows the wool production from those sheep during that same period. I hope every Senator will study these tables and see how their own States' agricultural economy is affected by this legislation.

Number of grazing units of livestock on farms and ranches in comparison with the number permitted on the national forests, 11 Western States, selected years, 1912-53

Year	Grazing units of livestock on farms, 11 Western States, Jan. 1 <sup>1</sup>			Grazing units of livestock permitted on the national forests <sup>2</sup>		
	Sheep and lambs <sup>3</sup>	Cattle, horses, and mules	Total	Sheep and goats	Cattle and horses	Total
	1912	5,076	10,105	15,181	1,510	1,425
1915	4,620	12,613	17,233	1,457	1,680	3,137
1918	4,529	15,506	20,035	1,702	2,180	3,882
1920	4,284	14,325	18,609	1,463	2,032	3,515
1923	3,744	13,292	17,036	1,341	1,806	3,147
1925	3,963	12,115	16,078	1,233	1,553	2,786
1930	5,009	10,419	15,428	1,339	1,372	2,711
1931	5,231	10,607	15,838	1,317	1,385	2,703
1935	4,707	11,283	15,990	1,135	1,358	2,493
1940	4,262	10,431	14,693	988	1,185	2,173
1942	4,410	11,724	16,134	948	1,189	2,137
1945	3,423	13,010	16,433	774	1,186	1,960
1947	2,701	12,339	15,040	677	1,139	1,816
1948	2,566	12,171	14,737	611	1,129	1,790
1949	2,436	12,306	14,742	616	1,101	1,717
1950	2,306	11,992	14,298	599	1,066	1,665
1951	2,370	12,724	15,094	600	1,060	1,660
1952	2,509	13,950	16,459	598	1,069	1,667
1953	2,529	14,651	17,180			

<sup>1</sup> A grazing unit of livestock as used in this table equals 1 horse, 1 mule, 1 head of cattle and calves, excluding milk cows, or 5 head of sheep and lambs.

<sup>2</sup> Animals under 6 months of age are not included in these figures since they graze free of charge with the other livestock.

<sup>3</sup> Excludes sheep and lambs on feed.



Number of sheep and lambs shorn, by States, 1909-53—Continued

[In thousands]

State and division	1928	1929	1930	1931	1932	1933	1934	1935	1936	1937	1938	1939	1940	1941	1942	1943	1944	1945
Delaware	3	3	3	4	4	4	3	3	3	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Maryland	87	89	92	86	90	85	83	80	73	70	61	58	57	54	54	48	44	44
Virginia	393	421	440	445	446	442	428	403	380	360	364	352	345	345	338	320	303	288
West Virginia	490	528	547	570	565	581	570	565	545	490	474	469	446	424	411	395	348	313
North Carolina	76	85	80	82	73	75	70	65	61	54	54	49	46	46	45	47	45	42
South Carolina	13	12	12	12	12	12	11	11	9	7	7	7	7	6	5	5	4	4
Georgia	36	34	33	32	30	30	32	29	27	24	23	20	18	17	16	16	16	16
Florida	42	40	38	37	37	36	35	34	32	30	28	26	24	22	21	19	15	12
South Atlantic	1,140	1,212	1,245	1,267	1,257	1,265	1,232	1,190	1,130	1,037	1,013	983	945	916	892	852	777	721
Kentucky	810	830	835	830	875	880	914	994	1,012	934	963	973	983	973	1,153	972	866	753
Tennessee	314	320	333	350	370	380	360	378	359	333	338	362	370	374	374	378	373	306
Alabama	50	52	47	44	41	42	45	40	38	37	38	34	33	32	32	31	29	24
Mississippi	80	83	83	83	78	73	72	60	60	63	63	57	56	57	60	68	74	79
Arkansas	50	49	48	50	55	58	57	54	66	72	78	85	82	86	92	92	82	71
Louisiana	215	200	215	210	210	213	215	234	210	220	225	235	240	243	255	221	196	192
Oklahoma	92	123	136	137	145	148	160	220	206	193	255	310	340	312	330	312	214	185
Texas	4,938	5,080	6,232	8,636	7,050	7,875	7,608	7,222	7,790	9,280	9,742	9,717	10,218	10,468	10,474	10,607	10,301	9,639
South Central	6,549	7,337	7,929	8,540	8,824	9,669	9,431	9,202	9,714	11,132	11,702	11,773	12,322	12,545	12,770	12,681	12,099	11,249
Montana	3,100	3,458	3,740	3,860	3,425	3,550	3,760	3,480	3,156	2,540	2,550	2,830	3,220	3,453	3,583	3,477	3,131	2,633
Idaho	1,894	2,040	2,040	2,134	1,940	2,020	2,170	2,063	2,000	2,010	1,878	1,773	1,732	1,767	1,775	1,593	1,397	1,258
Wyoming	3,100	3,155	3,264	3,600	3,463	3,240	3,496	3,174	3,058	3,055	3,140	3,269	3,304	3,406	3,435	3,367	2,937	2,600
Colorado	1,395	1,573	1,660	1,736	1,600	1,539	1,661	1,527	1,555	1,615	1,588	1,635	1,667	1,634	1,797	1,805	1,594	1,481
New Mexico	2,180	2,145	2,343	2,520	2,520	2,490	2,520	2,191	2,058	1,994	1,967	1,989	2,041	2,149	2,081	2,000	1,870	1,699
Arizona	980	970	940	920	870	860	830	810	756	792	781	769	633	637	635	594	554	491
Utah	2,480	2,430	2,600	2,692	2,355	2,315	2,370	2,250	2,280	2,075	2,096	2,002	1,990	1,990	2,009	1,831	1,729	1,581
Nevada	1,144	1,010	993	1,110	905	845	840	802	810	744	759	744	677	677	642	622	588	533
Washington	575	615	650	645	605	618	695	705	658	638	620	626	603	608	595	564	498	444
Oregon	2,210	2,271	2,380	2,500	2,240	2,210	2,280	2,139	1,925	1,843	1,708	1,667	1,575	1,528	1,452	1,277	1,097	954
California	3,351	3,338	3,528	3,622	3,370	3,128	2,965	3,243	3,490	3,350	3,457	3,474	3,357	3,357	3,429	3,416	3,230	2,993
Western	22,409	23,005	24,138	25,339	23,293	22,815	23,587	22,384	21,755	20,656	20,544	20,778	20,799	21,206	21,433	20,546	18,625	16,667
United States	39,795	42,011	44,549	46,832	45,207	46,005	46,421	44,991	44,663	44,284	44,889	45,195	46,313	47,722	49,287	47,892	43,165	38,763

Sheep shorn, 11 Western States and United States, 1946-53

[Head, in thousands]

	1946	1947	1948	1949	1950	1951	1952	1953
Montana	2,238	1,813	1,650	1,567	1,347	1,502	1,605	1,573
Idaho	1,132	1,053	1,053	1,000	940	950	998	989
Wyoming	2,395	2,203	2,092	1,782	1,712	1,853	2,017	1,998
Colorado	1,377	1,224	1,199	1,187	1,215	1,200	1,286	1,286
New Mexico	1,468	1,362	1,344	1,300	1,287	1,275	1,332	1,256
Arizona	443	405	363	361	382	342	350	381
Utah	1,502	1,337	1,322	1,228	1,180	1,252	1,313	1,326
Nevada	493	444	430	412	421	443	446	442
Washington	402	367	321	287	285	295	311	326
Oregon	800	705	653	635	624	592	634	634
California	2,525	2,268	2,005	1,995	2,017	2,086	2,140	2,289
Total, Western States	14,775	13,181	12,442	11,754	11,410	11,790	12,432	12,500
United States	34,647	30,953	28,649	26,382	26,387	27,357	28,172	27,756

Production of shorn wool, by States, 1909-53

[In thousands of pounds]

State and division	1909	1910	1911	1912	1913	1914	1915	1916	1917	1918	1919	1920	1921	1922	1923	1924	1925	1926	1927
Maine	1,038	894	936	951	897	824	775	741	752	770	696	670	540	484	479	493	526	559	546
New Hampshire	224	186	195	198	182	161	151	158	161	168	160	160	143	113	109	94	102	110	117
Vermont	635	605	543	567	464	396	355	375	328	353	394	402	322	270	252	277	252	277	292
Massachusetts	136	144	150	134	122	108	105	99	90	97	101	104	96	84	73	67	68	62	63
Rhode Island	28	30	30	22	16	15	15	16	18	18	18	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12
Connecticut	69	69	77	72	57	52	47	42	38	46	53	58	54	48	40	41	41	43	41
New York	4,264	3,992	4,155	4,340	3,856	3,244	3,087	3,133	3,216	3,542	3,720	3,387	2,980	2,797	2,599	2,708	2,898	3,081	3,212
New Jersey	88	84	84	77	72	66	62	56	50	60	65	58	50	42	36	31	31	32	32
Pennsylvania	4,141	4,322	4,514	4,402	3,604	2,970	2,834	2,747	2,870	3,241	3,451	3,206	3,053	3,073	2,990	2,766	2,805	2,730	2,730
North Atlantic	10,623	10,326	10,684	10,763	9,270	7,836	7,431	7,367	7,523	8,295	8,658	8,063	7,259	6,923	6,591	6,489	6,735	6,906	7,045
Ohio	21,818	22,720	21,300	19,089	17,813	15,776	13,680	12,652	13,588	14,375	15,218	14,929	13,691	13,120	13,699	14,167	14,467	14,760	15,662
Indiana	5,508	5,856	5,713	5,451	4,900	3,767	3,269	3,136	2,989	3,550	3,924	3,485	3,499	3,294	3,380	3,391	3,562	3,715	3,922
Illinois	5,066	5,117	5,628	4,780	3,789	2,949	2,670	2,985	3,239	3,968	4,150	3,868	3,578	3,078	2,978	3,351	3,352	3,794	4,186
Michigan	12,802	12,982	14,090	12,676	10,629	8,826	7,980	7,777	7,160	7,552	7,886	7,020	6,346	6,256	6,478	6,880	7,416	7,600	8,446
Wisconsin	5,351	4,725	4,482	3,955	3,628	3,103	2,866	2,812	2,923	3,002	3,189	2,960	2,520	2,278	2,131	2,109	2,250	2,475	2,771
East North Central	50,545	51,400	51,213	45,951	40,759	34,421	30,465	29,362	29,899	32,477	34,367	32,262	29,634	27,936	28,666	29,928	31,047	32,344	34,900
Minnesota	3,355	3,319	3,182	2,635	2,318	2,883	2,030	2,030	2,992	2,701	3,139	2,904	3,066	2,781	2,645	2,886	3,151	3,634	4,211
Iowa	5,888	5,948	7,228	7,015	5,688	5,670	4,140	4,112	4,297	5,438	6,856	5,968	5,632	5,226	5,242	5,360	5,440	5,520	5,880
Missouri	7,670	7,993	7,964	6,592	5,613	4,811	4,476	5,386	6,237	6,685	7,704	7,121	6,596	5,520	5,396	5,605	5,537	5,500	5,505
North Dakota	2,099	1,722	1,652	1,490	1,426	1,342	1,159	1,380	1,465	1,710	1,999	1,918	1,654	1,398	1,440	1,853	2,263	2,772	3,654
South Dakota	3,438	3,427	3,257	2,981															

Production of shorn wool, by States, 1909-53—Continued

[In thousands of pounds]

Table with columns for State and division and years 1909-1927. Rows include Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, South Atlantic, Kentucky, Tennessee, Alabama, Mississippi, Arkansas, Louisiana, Oklahoma, Texas, South Central, Montana, Idaho, Wyoming, Colorado, New Mexico, Arizona, Utah, Nevada, Washington, Oregon, California, Western, and United States.

Table with columns for State and division and years 1928-1945. Rows include Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, North Atlantic, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, Wisconsin, East North Central, Minnesota, Iowa, Missouri, North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, Kansas, West North Central, North Central, Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, South Atlantic, Kentucky, Tennessee, Alabama, Mississippi, Arkansas, Louisiana, Oklahoma, Texas, South Central, Montana, Idaho, Wyoming, Colorado, New Mexico, Arizona, Utah, Nevada.

Production of shorn wool, by States, 1909-53—Continued

[In thousands of pounds]

State and division	1928	1929	1930	1931	1932	1933	1934	1935	1936	1937	1938	1939	1940	1941	1942	1943	1944	1945
Washington.....	5,635	5,485	6,175	6,192	5,506	5,686	6,602	6,486	5,988	5,597	5,651	5,689	5,446	5,778	5,496	5,132	4,555	3,977
Oregon.....	20,332	19,531	21,420	22,000	18,144	18,785	19,836	18,609	16,555	15,850	15,543	14,836	14,016	14,058	12,923	10,471	9,654	8,300
California.....	24,230	24,735	25,779	26,095	24,219	24,032	20,407	24,288	24,044	22,577	25,035	24,558	23,415	24,615	23,954	22,375	21,505	20,408
Western.....	186,581	187,282	203,606	216,721	188,472	190,745	197,452	189,305	181,296	174,992	176,821	176,175	179,756	186,549	184,779	173,899	155,874	141,890
United States.....	314,820	327,795	352,129	376,301	350,996	374,152	368,860	361,531	353,211	356,078	359,925	361,689	372,014	387,520	388,297	378,843	338,318	307,949

Wool production, 11 Western States and United States

[Thousands of pounds]

	1946	1947	1948	1949	1950	1951	1952	1953
Montana.....	21,485	16,498	15,510	13,946	12,662	14,569	15,568	15,258
Idaho.....	10,754	10,425	10,530	9,800	9,400	9,595	9,880	9,989
Wyoming.....	23,950	21,810	20,083	17,285	17,120	19,642	20,170	20,180
Colorado.....	12,378	11,138	10,311	10,090	11,098	11,580	11,688	11,636
New Mexico.....	12,744	12,019	11,519	11,303	11,309	11,067	11,590	11,349
Arizona.....	3,187	3,027	2,638	2,736	2,886	2,481	2,590	2,808
Utah.....	13,969	12,702	12,295	10,684	10,855	12,019	12,211	12,464
Nevada.....	4,190	3,818	3,655	3,592	3,578	3,898	3,880	3,757
Washington.....	3,565	3,409	3,066	2,603	2,598	2,794	2,927	3,098
Oregon.....	6,800	6,204	6,100	5,207	5,366	5,506	5,706	5,579
California.....	17,607	15,013	13,951	14,302	14,936	15,889	15,850	16,135
11 Western States.....	130,629	116,063	109,658	101,458	101,809	108,740	112,060	112,253
United States.....	280,908	251,425	231,770	212,899	215,422	225,545	232,373	230,343

This is indeed a serious situation when you compare the decline of sheep population and the decline of American wool production with the imports of wool during these same periods. I call your attention to this next table prepared for me by the Department of Agriculture which gives you such a comparison. It goes so far as to compare the American production, the imports and the actual mill consumption. For instance, it shows that in 1938, when our textile mills consumed 499 million pounds of wool grease basis, that our own American producers and workers furnished 360 million pounds of that wool and we had to import only 45 million pounds. In 1938, before tariff duties had been made ineffective by inflation and currency manipulation in for-

ign countries, before the executive branch of the Government had traded off our American jobs and farm production under the Trade Agreements Act by lowering the duties set by Congress, the tariff allowed this American industry to live and prosper.

In other words, when Pearl Harbor occurred, we produced 80 percent of our wool requirements. Now let's look at the year 1951. That shows that mill consumption that year was 993 million pounds, nearly 3 times as great as that 1938 figure I just gave you. But what had happened in the meantime. That year we imported 568 million pounds of foreign wool and produced only 267 million pounds of domestic wool. Our American market was 3 times as great, but our imports were 14 times as large and

our domestic production had been cut nearly in half. Now that is not the full story because the imports and the domestic production was much larger than the mill consumption, so what happened? The inadequate tariff duties allowed the foreign wool to come into the United States and be used by the mills while the wool produced by American growers went into a Government stockpile at the expense of American taxpayers.

I cannot for the life of me see what kind of foreign trade policy could contemplate allowing this situation to develop unless someone is bent on the utter destruction of the wool industry and the economy of the United States.

United States population, number of sheep and apparel wool production, imports and mill consumption in the United States

Year	Population of United States	Sheep, Jan. 1		Wool, grease basis					Wool, scoured basis				
		All sheep	Stock sheep	Production			Imports <sup>2</sup>	Mill consumption	Production			Imports	Mill consumption
				Shorn	Pulled <sup>1</sup>	Total			Shorn	Pulled	Total		
	Million	1,000 head	1,000 head	Million pounds	Million pounds	Million pounds	Million pounds (°)	Million pounds	Million pounds	Million pounds	Million pounds (°)	Million pounds	
1920.....	105.2	40,743	37,328	251	69	320	601	110	32	142	142	264	
1925.....	117.5	38,543	34,469	253	75	328	224	572	116	35	141	99	
1926.....	119.0	40,363	35,719	269	79	348	236	579	119	37	156	104	
1927.....	120.7	42,415	38,067	289	80	369	176	588	127	38	165	77	
1928.....	122.2	45,258	40,689	315	83	398	108	528	138	39	177	47	
1929.....	123.5	48,381	43,481	328	87	415	138	575	144	41	185	61	
1930.....	124.8	51,565	45,577	352	99	451	105	456	155	46	201	46	
1931.....	125.8	53,233	47,720	376	106	482	53	540	166	49	215	23	
1932.....	126.6	53,902	47,682	351	107	458	20	428	154	51	205	9	
1933.....	127.3	53,054	47,303	374	102	476	53	558	165	48	213	23	
1934.....	128.1	53,503	48,244	369	97	466	42	381	162	46	208	18	
1935.....	129.0	51,808	46,139	361	106	467	61	725	159	50	209	27	
1936.....	129.8	51,136	45,435	353	106	459	159	631	155	50	205	70	
1937.....	130.6	50,848	45,251	356	106	462	206	623	157	49	206	91	
1938.....	131.6	51,063	44,972	360	103	463	45	499	158	49	207	20	
1939.....	132.7	51,348	45,463	362	103	465	133	666	159	49	208	59	
1940.....	134.0	52,107	46,206	372	99	471	269	705	164	46	210	118	
1941.....	135.3	53,920	47,441	388	105	493	761	1,169	171	49	220	335	
1942.....	136.7	56,213	49,346	388	107	495	1,039	1,274	171	50	221	457	
1943.....	138.6	55,150	48,196	379	104	483	903	1,371	167	49	216	397	
1944.....	140.3	50,782	44,270	338	118	456	784	1,311	149	55	204	345	
1945.....	141.8	46,520	39,609	308	113	421	950	1,339	136	52	188	418	
1946.....	143.4	42,436	35,525	281	98	379	1,075	1,385	124	46	170	473	
1947.....	146.1	37,818	31,805	251	91	342	589	1,195	111	42	153	259	
1948.....	148.7	34,827	29,486	232	75	307	560	1,103	102	35	137	246	
1949.....	151.3	31,654	26,940	213	57	270	352	770	94	26	120	155	
1950.....	153.8	29,826	26,182	215	52	267	568	993	95	24	119	250	
1951.....	156.5	30,635	27,253	226	41	267	618	868	99	20	119	272	
1952.....	159.2	32,088	28,050	232	54	286	564	788	102	25	127	248	
1953.....	161.9	31,861	27,857	230	66	296	376	801	101	31	132	166	
1954.....	163.4	30,902	26,905										

<sup>1</sup> Converted to domestic greasy shorn equivalent on basis of 1 pound pulled wool equal to 1.6 pounds greasy shorn wool.  
<sup>2</sup> Apparel wool converted to domestic greasy shorn equivalent on basis scoured yield equal to 44 percent of greasy shorn wool.  
<sup>3</sup> Mill consumption by years and the totals of production and imports do not balance due to difference in stocks carried over from year to year.  
<sup>4</sup> Not available.  
<sup>5</sup> Revision based upon Wool Production and Income Report dated Feb. 25, 1954.  
<sup>6</sup> Preliminary or estimated.

Certainly S. 2911, as introduced, does not eliminate the problems created by this inadequate wool-tariff situation.

This wool is a complex trade problem. To really understand the impact of imports on a domestic grower who has no protection, you must realize the United States market is sought, not just because of its consumption figures, but some countries have been subsidizing exporters to the United States in order to get American dollars. I have here a series of tables which will well illustrate this and which require close study if this Senate is to properly legislate on a measure designed to help an industry reeling under the impacts of growing foreign competition. The first of these is a table on the estimated world supply and disposition of apparel wool from 1934 through 1953. Then there is a table on world wool production from 1948 through 1953. This chart shows world production up while United States production is down, all since the wool tariffs were reduced under the Geneva agreement on trades and tariff. Taking this story in sequence, the next table shows the duty-paid imports of wool into the United States from specified countries.

**Apparel wool: Estimated world supply and disposition, average 1934-39 and 1940-45; and annual 1945-46 through 1952-53 season (grease basis)**

Year <sup>1</sup>	[In millions of pounds]				
	Supply			Disposition	
	Carry-in stocks	Production	Total	Consumption	Closing stock
1934-39 average	1,825	2,991	4,816	3,103	1,713
1940-45 average	2,961	3,291	6,252	2,580	3,672
1945-46	5,357	2,964	8,321	3,299	5,022
1946-47	5,022	2,982	8,004	3,530	4,474
1947-48	4,474	2,931	7,405	3,854	3,551
1948-49	3,551	2,965	6,516	3,528	2,988
1949-50	2,988	3,100	6,088	3,960	2,128
1950-51	2,128	3,115	5,243	3,584	1,859
1951-52	1,859	3,100	5,049	3,060	1,989
1952-53	1,989	3,320	5,309	3,300	2,009
1953-54	2,009				

<sup>1</sup> Stocks are for July 1. Consumption applies to calendar year beginning halfway through the season; i. e., 1951-52 refers to consumption in 1952.

**World wool production, 6 principal wool countries and world**

Country	[Million pounds, grease basis]		
	1953 <sup>1</sup>	1952	1951
Argentina	430	420	420
Australia	1,250	1,240	1,052
New Zealand	418	413	407
Union of South Africa	250	245	240
United States	260	266	251
Uruguay	195	190	187
All others	1,527	1,516	1,462
Estimated world total	4,330	4,290	4,020
	1950	1949	1948
Argentina	430	415	419
Australia	1,092	1,110	1,031
New Zealand	390	390	397
Union of South Africa	228	218	219
United States	248	249	278
Uruguay	185	163	144
All others	1,398	1,346	1,312
Estimated world total	3,970	3,890	3,770

<sup>1</sup> Preliminary.

Source: USDA as reported in NAMW bulletin, Current Statistics of Wool Manufacture (November issue).

**Duty-paid imports of wool, actual weight, into the United States, by specified countries, 1924-52<sup>1</sup>**

[Thousands of pounds]

Year	Argentina	Australia	New Zealand	South Africa	Uruguay	China	United Kingdom	Eire	Syria	Iraq	India	Egypt	Other countries	Total <sup>2</sup>
1924	32,114	35,384	5,866	4,956	8,607	62,434	60,845	404	4,347	0	3,459	1,521	28,111	248,408
1925	36,273	55,654	10,675	8,027	26,302	60,347	68,367	215	6,747	0	8,138	1,735	37,837	320,317
1926	40,217	51,188	18,452	13,773	32,767	21,296	59,769	95	5,299	1,762	5,505	2,127	28,404	280,633
1927	26,657	39,389	5,466	5,614	16,870	44,008	55,898	259	7,836	6,919	9,164	2,288	29,879	250,247
1928	21,706	26,362	9,598	4,410	6,862	47,689	44,520	622	8,430	6,702	11,459	2,345	31,564	222,269
1929	36,973	26,193	10,723	3,459	22,080	46,079	36,908	1,403	8,507	7,004	14,072	3,410	35,188	251,999
1930	31,223	22,074	7,171	4,796	13,253	24,966	16,422	238	2,921	4,701	6,848	1,265	14,095	149,973
1931	31,732	22,968	1,803	2,404	5,140	24,796	12,217	363	4,854	5,552	8,293	2,712	15,930	138,764
1932	10,766	8,532	1,977	1,832	483	5,664	5,779	218	1,980	1,550	5,029	1,037	4,260	49,107
1933	43,680	10,019	3,964	1,152	4,580	23,812	25,517	1,509	2,554	3,064	11,799	2,904	17,532	152,116
1934	6,705	7,446	2,028	573	4,315	557	6,990	135	0	14	914	12	3,264	32,953
1935	10,942	9,617	3,442	425	4,800	685	10,308	185	(?)	0	555	0	4,966	45,925
1936	24,656	31,279	8,829	3,683	22,265	1,476	17,356	129	7	68	983	9	7,893	118,633
1937	28,921	69,587	16,166	4,416	21,730	725	7,387	611	23	24	1,208	0	4,673	155,371
1938	10,487	6,602	5,839	530	2,828	283	3,590	254	0	0	726	0	1,605	32,644
1939	22,127	29,400	11,117	8,329	16,724	287	4,998	427	4	1	1,773	42	4,263	99,492
1940	84,154	39,472	4,452	31,260	44,348	445	1,800	0	0	4	741	59	15,916	222,651
1941	189,555	237,660	5,345	43,666	103,816	278	1,384	0	(?)	0	42	96	23,225	605,068
1942	137,625	507,142	25,010	77,290	29,582	7	763	1,606	0	659	437	97	14,210	794,493
1943	147,874	298,318	23,456	43,438	100,004	684	476	948	44	383	748	0	33,020	648,924
1944	149,624	212,553	20,226	23,937	102,326	(?)	192	329	0	(?)	151	0	38,240	547,725
1945	116,229	200,125	49,459	38,484	143,062	329	1,091	327	0	32	368	0	36,167	675,673
1946	164,790	353,511	54,251	121,069	92,124	31	1,570	425	1	11	99	22	24,015	811,909
1947	77,195	214,309	30,442	42,232	62,450	2	618	378	3	0	160	0	10,820	438,752
1948	97,717	143,651	18,567	32,122	102,176	117	598	451	37	0	160	0	10,820	416,261
1949	38,155	99,054	13,333	27,600	67,434	14	268	425	2	(?)	58	23	15,911	232,277
1950	72,485	138,048	28,204	22,178	119,344	154	1,442	457	139	93	588	0	18,901	402,033
1951	42,465	190,932	34,415	42,385	93,211	153	1,497	538	69	14	137	0	24,798	430,614
1952	48,918	141,249	74,855	43,545	49,856	70	1,698	829	197	246	662	0	17,552	379,677

<sup>1</sup> Wool not advanced in any manner or by any process of manufacture beyond washed, soured, or carbonized condition. Data for 1924-33 are general imports; beginning 1934, imports for consumption.

<sup>2</sup> Revised annual totals.

<sup>3</sup> Less than 500 pounds.

<sup>4</sup> Excludes dutiable wools entered free as an act of international courtesy for storage and re-export.

<sup>5</sup> Preliminary.

Source: Compiled from reports of the U. S. Department of Commerce.

[From the Christian Science Monitor of April 20, 1954]

**TEXTILE PANEL ASKS BRAKE ON IMPORTS**

BOSTON.—A greatly stiffened tariff policy to bolster New England's depressed textile industry has been recommended by the New England Textile Committee, which has charged that "increased imports of foreign textile products are hindering the industry's rise from a state of depression involving widespread unemployment."

The committee was appointed by the six New England governors. Comprising 21 leading New Englanders as members—representing labor, management, and the public—the group submitted the following recommendations:

"1. That there should be no further reductions in tariff rates on any of the different classes of textiles.

"2. That tariff rates should be raised on textile products where foreign imports cause or threaten to cause unemployment in any segment of the industry."

**GOVERNORS GET REPORT**

The committee report was submitted to the six governors and to the New England congressional delegation.

William Dwight, of Holyoke, public representative from Massachusetts, and chairman of the committee, said:

"The New England textile industry is an industry of highly competitive small businesses and needs protection from low-wage foreign competition. Superior productivity in New England cannot offset wage differentials of 200 to 1,400 percent. Increased imports of foreign textile products are hindering the recovery of New England's textile industry. Meanwhile, displaced textile workers are experiencing difficulty in finding new jobs. One out of every twelve New Englanders is directly connected with textiles, and all of New England is indirectly affected by the welfare of this leading industry."

The report said uncontrolled competition from low-wage foreign producers seriously can damage the New England textile indus-

try, the New England economy, and the national textile industry.

**LACE SITUATION CITED**

"As an example of what can happen in a short period of time in textiles," it continued, "consider the case of lace manufacturers predominantly located in the Blackstone and Pawtuxet Valley areas of Rhode Island.

"In the 2 years following the reciprocal trade agreements program with France, in conjunction with the devaluation of the French franc, which in substance meant still further tariff reduction, the lace industry in Rhode Island found itself with 66 percent of its workers unemployed and the remaining 34 percent working an average of 14½ hours a week."

The report said that during the past 20 years there have been large reductions in tariff rates on textiles through reciprocal trade agreements and concluded:

"The New England Textile Committee favors protection of workers, stockholders, and the public from the low-wage competition of foreign countries."

[From the Boston Daily Globe of April 20, 1954]

**TARIFF PROTECTION FOR TEXTILE INDUSTRY  
URGED BY COMMITTEE**

Declaring that recovery of the New England textile industry from widespread unemployment "is being hindered by increased imports of foreign textile products," the New England Textile Committee, in a statement released for publication today, recommends greater tariff protection for New England textile mills.

The committee, consisting of representatives of labor, management, and the public appointed by New England governors, makes two specific recommendations:

1. That there should be no further reductions in tariff rates on any of the different classes of textiles.

2. That tariff rates should be raised on textile products where foreign imports cause, or threaten to cause, unemployment in any segment of the industry.

The committee points out that labor costs represent about two-thirds of the cost of manufacturing in the textile industry and that "in competition with foreign producers the wage differential varies between 200 and 1,400 percent."

In New England, the committee says, about 220,000 persons are employed in the textile industry and another 220,000 persons are indirectly dependent on the industry. Many of the New England textile mills, it points out, are in small towns where they provide the sole or principal source of outside income to the community.

[From the Boston Herald of April 20, 1954]

**NEW ENGLAND TEXTILES, FACING STRIKES, ASK  
MORE TARIFF PROTECTION**

The New England textile industry, now facing strikes and strike threats in an attempt to roll back wages, yesterday appealed to Washington for better tariff protection.

Composed of labor, management, and public members, the New England Textile Committee asked Congress to retain tariffs on all foreign textiles and to increase the rate of those foreign imports that are contributing to unemployment.

Singled out for comment were French lace, combed cotton goods from western Europe and Japan, Italian and Japanese velveteens, English tweeds, and similar highly competitive foreign products.

The report came as workers at the Bachmann Uxbridge Worsted Corp.'s organized mills said they would strike tonight rather than accept a 15-cent wage cut management has ordered effective tomorrow.

William Dwight, of Holyoke, chairman of the 21-member, 6-State textile committee, reported:

"Increased imports of foreign textile products are hindering the recovery of New England's textile industry. Meanwhile, displaced textile workers are experiencing difficulty in finding new jobs.

"Superior productivity in New England cannot offset wage differentials of 200 to 1,400 percent."

In the 2 years following the last reciprocal trade agreements program, French lace imports forced into unemployment 66 percent of Rhode Island laceworkers and reduced the remainder to a workweek of 14½ hours, the committee said.

Failure at a negotiations session today at the South Barre plant will bring a walkout at six Bachmann Uxbridge plants in New England tomorrow morning, John Chupka, director of the UTW worsted and woolens division, said.

**TO PICKET PLANTS**

The textile-workers union said that all 3,000 workers in the plants, both union and nonunion, will walk out in protest of the wage cut. Union picket lines will be placed at the unorganized plants in Uxbridge, Pascoag, R. I., and Woonsocket, as well as at

the union plants in South Barre, Putnam, Conn., and North Smithfield, R. I.

The union said that refusal of Bachmann Uxbridge to submit the issues to arbitration would touch off the strike.

At Woonsocket, 4,300 textile workers went back to work yesterday after a 1-week strike against wage reductions. Members of the Independent Industrial Trades Union, they accepted an extension of present contracts.

American Woolen Co., which has demanded wage reductions in its plants, will meet with CIO textile workers representatives tomorrow in contract negotiations.

[From the Boston Post of April 20, 1954]

**MILLS AND UNIONS URGE HIGHER TEXTILE  
TARIFFS**

(By James F. Leonard)

A stiffened tariff policy to bulwark the depressed textile industry was recommended yesterday by a panel of textile experts, labor union officials, and economists who have been studying the textile industry's plight in New England.

The group recommended a twofold policy calling for additional tariff rates on textile products where unemployment has become a problem because of foreign imports, and strict adherence to the present tariff structure on the different classes of textiles.

As the committee's report was being released, the CIO Textile Workers Union announced that 2,200 former employees of Textron, Inc., in four defunct New Hampshire mills have been awarded an estimated \$150,000 in back pay by an arbitrator.

The twin announcements came also as about 3,500 CIO members and nonunion workers in the Bachmann Uxbridge mills prepared to stage a strike tomorrow against a company demand for a 15 cents an hour wage cut.

A second strike is also contemplated over the pay cut demand, the CIO announced. J. William Belanger said his union has been served notice by the American Woolen Co. that it wants some 3,000 employees to take a 21-cent-an-hour cut, and that a strike is contemplated next Monday if the order is not withdrawn.

Belanger and other CIO officials are members of the panel of textile experts who called for the stiffened tariff policy as an aid to the depressed industry.

There is a graphic story to be obtained from the study of these tables. I have a series of documents here which point how all of this comes down to the very plight the American wool growers are found in today.

First, here is a table showing the United States raw wool tariffs from 1922 to date. Remember now, there is no tariff on non-competitive wools. Coarse wools chiefly used in manufacture of carpets come in duty free. But this table will show that on apparel wools, the executive branch of the Government has reduced the tariffs set by the Congress to the lowest point of that entire period. Mr. President, tariffs on wool are lower than they were in the Tariff Act of 1922. The duty on wools finer than 44's in the grease was set in the act of 1922 at 31 cents a pound. In 1930 this duty was raised by the Congress to 34 cents per pound. But when Congress turned over its constitutional responsibility to the State Department to regulate foreign commerce, that agency negotiated an agreement with Australia, New Zealand, and the Union of South Africa so the duty on imported wool today is only 25½ cents per pound.

To understand what that means you have to study this next table on the price per pound of domestic wool, imported wool, and wool in foreign markets. This chart shows these comparative figures from 1920 to date and it is easy to see the depressing effect on the domestic wool prices from the lower duty imports since the trade agreements lowered the tariffs.

Perhaps one of the most easily recognized effects of these increasing imports can be seen from this next table. It shows the amount of wool imported into the United States each year since 1938. It shows the duty paid and the percentage of domestic mill consumption supplied by imports, and then, I think, the column which shows the declining percentage of wool growers' income from his wool because of the decrease in duties.

This table shows for instance that in 1938, only 10 percent of our domestic consumption was supplied by imports and 45 percent of a grower's income was from his wool. In 1952, 71 percent of our mill consumption was supplied by foreign producers and a grower's income from wool had dropped to 36 percent of his total.

**UNITED STATES RAW WOOL TARIFFS, 1922 TO  
DATE**

[Cents per pound of clean content, except as noted]  
**Wools finer than 44's**

	Act of 1922	Act of 1930	1948 <sup>1</sup>
In the grease or washed.....	31	34	25½
Scoured.....	31	37	27¾
On the skin.....	30	32	24
Sorted or matchings, if not scoured.....	31	35	26¼

**Wool and hair, advanced in any manner be-  
yond the washed or scoured condition, in-  
cluding tops, but not further advanced  
than roving**

	Act of 1922	Act of 1930	1939 <sup>2</sup>	1948 <sup>3</sup>
Carbonized.....	31	37 plus 20%	37 plus 12½%	27¾ plus 6¼%
Other.....	31	37 plus 20%	37 plus 12½%	27¾ plus 12½%

**Wool finer than 40's, but not finer than 44's**

	Act of 1922	Act of 1930	1941 <sup>4</sup>
In the grease or washed.....	31	29	17
Scoured.....	31	32	20
On the skin.....	30	27	15
Sorted or matchings, if not scoured.....	31	30	18

**Native or unimproved wools and other wool  
not finer than 40's<sup>5</sup>**

	Act of 1922 <sup>6</sup>	Act of 1930	1941
In the grease.....	12	24	4 13
Washed.....	18	24	4 13
Scoured.....	24	27	4 16
On the skin.....	11	22	4 11
Sorted or matchings, if not scoured.....	12 or 18	25	7 15

<sup>1</sup> The lower rates became effective Jan. 1, 1948. They were negotiated jointly with Australia, New Zealand, and the Union of South Africa under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade.

<sup>2</sup> The lower rates became effective in 1939 under the terms of the trade agreement with the United Kingdom.

<sup>3</sup> A lower rate for carbonized wool in this class was negotiated with New Zealand under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade and became effective July 31, 1948. The existing rate in the bilateral agreement with the United Kingdom was rebounded to that country under the General Agreement for the other wool in this class.

<sup>4</sup> The lower rates were first part of the agreements with Argentina and Uruguay of 1941 and 1943, respectively. They were subsequently bound under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade in negotiations with New Zealand.

<sup>5</sup> Under Tariff Act of 1922 native or unimproved wools enterable duty free if used in the manufacture of rugs, carpets, or other floor coverings. Under the Tariff Act of 1930, all wools not finer than 40's are enterable duty-free if used in the manufacture of floor coverings, press cloths, knit or felt boots, heavy filled lumbermen's socks.

<sup>6</sup> Cents per pound of actual weight.  
<sup>7</sup> The lower rate became effective in 1941 as part of the trade agreement with Argentina. It was subsequently bound in the agreement with Uruguay of 1943 and to India and Pakistan in 1948 under the General Agreement.

Price per pound of fine wool, clean basis,  
at Boston and at London, 1920 to date

Year	[In cents]		
	Domestic fine territory good French combing and staple at Boston	British Dominion	
		Australian 64s/70s good top-making at Boston (excluding duty)	64s/70s combing at London
1920	166.0		
1921	85.0		63.4
1922	125.0		95.9
1923	141.0		112.1
1924	141.2	131.0	130.3
1925	139.0	120.0	116.4
1926	116.2	99.8	95.1
1927	110.3	100.4	95.8
1928	116.1	102.0	98.3
1929	98.1	81.0	74.3
1930	76.2	56.1	51.2
1931	63.1	46.6	36.7
1932	47.0	30.7	28.9
1933	67.1	45.9	45.5
1934	81.6	61.9	58.8
1935	74.8	52.6	52.6
1936	92.0	66.2	65.4
1937	101.9	71.9	73.0
1938	70.4	50.4	51.9
1939	82.7	52.4	(C)
1940	96.3	61.4	(C)
1941	108.8	69.5	(C)
1942	119.1	75.4	(C)
1943	117.8	75.9	(C)
1944	119.0	72.1	(C)
1945	117.7	75.2	(C)
1946	102.6	76.1	(C)
1947	124.2	102.9	115.1
1948	164.6	159.9	179.6
1949	166.4	170.3	182.0
1950	199.2	198.7	216.2
1951	270.5	259.1	262.7
1952	165.3	150.0	166.8
1953	173.0	176.7	194.4
1954:			
January	172.5	177.5	183.9
February	172.5	177.5	175.8
March	167.5	172.5	173.6

<sup>1</sup> London auctions suspended August 1939 to August 1946.

Duties on imports of wool into the United States in relation to world prices of wool, percentage of domestic woolgrowers' gross income derived from wool and percentage of domestic mill consumption supplied by imports

Year	Wool imported in greasy state <sup>1</sup>			Wool-growers' gross income derived from wool <sup>2</sup>	Domestic mill consumption supplied by imports <sup>3</sup>
	Average foreign value	Average duty	Ad valorem equivalent		
1938	41.8	28.9	69.0	45.2	10.2
1939	37.5	30.7	81.8	47.3	22.1
1940	45.0	32.5	72.1	52.5	39.9
1941	48.9	32.8	67.1	53.1	34.6
1942	50.5	31.5	62.5	50.8	73.0
1943	52.3	32.5	62.2	50.3	65.6
1944	49.2	31.0	63.0	53.9	73.3
1945	50.3	31.7	63.0	49.5	78.8
1946	49.2	31.0	63.0	43.7	74.6
1947	62.0	31.3	50.5	36.7	58.5
1948	86.5	24.4	27.3	37.9	55.3
1949	109.4	24.5	22.4	36.7	52.2
1950	113.3	24.4	21.6	38.5	57.2
1951	216.3	24.5	11.3	44.3	72.6
1952	117.9	23.7	20.1	36.8	71.3

<sup>1</sup> Dutiable wools weighted in proportion to imports for consumption of the different classes in each year. Based on data of the U. S. Tariff Commission.

<sup>2</sup> Bureau of Agricultural Economics; includes an allowance for the estimated value of pulled wool obtained from sheep and lambs slaughtered.

<sup>3</sup> Domestic disappearance of imported apparel wool (imports and changes in stocks) as a percentage of total apparel mill consumption, year beginning Apr. 1.

<sup>4</sup> Clean basis.

NOTE.—With the United States on an import basis, the tariff on wool tends to maintain prices of domestic wool above the world market level. The General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade of 1948 in general reduced the duties on wool 25 percent. The duty of 34 cents per clean pound as established under the Tariff Act of 1930 for wool finer than 44s was reduced to 25½ cents per clean pound. As the general price level has increased, the protection afforded by the tariff has become relatively less, both in relation to wool prices and in terms of prices of things woolgrowers buy.

Faced with conditions as shown in that last table, it is no wonder that the Nevada Wool Growers Association at their last convention passed this resolution and I quote: "The Nevada Wool Growers Association firmly believes in the principle, flexible tariff on imported wool adjusted on the basis of fair and reasonable competition. The association is opposed to the extension of the 1934 Trade Agreements Act and is in favor of the expiration of this act in June 1954. With the expiration of the 1934 Trade Agreements Act, the Congress of the United States automatically reassumes its constitutional responsibility to regulate foreign commerce through the adjustment of the duties commonly known as tariffs and import fees through its agent the Tariff Commission. The association realizes other industries are affected in similar ways and recommends fair treatment for all industries as a national policy."

Does that resolution sound as though the woolgrowers want a subsidy program? I think it sounds more like they expect the Members of the Senate to accept their responsibility. The Members of this body represent every man, woman, and child in the United States. They are responsible to the electorate. They are responsive to the conditions at home. But that is not the case with the staff of the Department of State, the career men who sell our domestic producers down the river to curry favor with foreign diplomats.

With more and more sheepmen going out of business, with banks foreclosing on sheep outfits driven to the wall by foreign imports, our own Government has forced the woolgrowers into a position of seeking a subsidy to even stay alive. It was for no other reason that the National Wool Growers Association said, when they endorsed this pending wool bill: "This endorsement of the President's wool program was not quickly or easily arrived at, because the industry believes that any long-range solution to the problem created by the 50-cent decline in production over the past decade must of necessity be found in a fair and equitable tariff to protect both producers and workers of the United States against unfair competition from countries which do not have the standards of living and wage levels of this country."

The people back home are dissatisfied. Producers are being forced out of business, workers are losing jobs and I hope Congress will soon realize what the people back home are already saying. Let me read you this resolution from the Nevada State Cattle Association:

#### "FOREIGN TRADE

"Whereas promotion of world trade should be on a basis of fair and reasonable competition, having due regard for a balanced domestic economy and safeguarding the living standards of the American people: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the responsibility and authority for the adjustment of duties, imports, and excises to regulate foreign trade be restored to Congress, as provided in the Constitution, and that the Reciprocal Trade Act which transferred such authority to the President and State Department be allowed to expire in June 1954."

The income situation of woolgrowers in relation to the prices and wages they pay, make it imperative that this Congress act upon some measure to assist the industry, and this amendment I have introduced will give the wool industry the tariff protection it needs. Let us refer here to some additional tables. First is one showing the average prices received by farmers per pound of shorn wool and per hundredweight on sheep and lambs as compared to beef cattle, from 1909 to 1952. Another chart shows wool prices as related to prices of all crops and to meat animals from 1935 to the present. It shows, for instance, that wool prices

have been below the others ever since about 1942, with one exception. That was when the Korean war broke out and our Government, caught with a dying American industry, rushed out and tried to buy all the wool in the world because it was such an essential war material. They forced the price to an alltime high, but the growers got little benefit of that in the United States. The wool had nearly all been clipped and sold when that occurred, because the Government changed its mind after that and changed its buying policy, creating a very grave situation in the domestic market.

Combined with this is a table on the index of prices paid by woolgrowers and if you note it carefully you will see that using 1935 as a base, wage rates have gone up over 400 percent. The sheep industry is an industry which is especially dependent upon an adequate supply of specialized labor. The hired labor bill on one-band sheep ranches in the intermountain regions of the western United States has climbed from \$1,700 in 1942 to \$5,500 in 1952. Now compare that with the next chart which shows you what this means in the way of competition with foreign producers. That shows the cash costs per sheep in the United States and Australia. Wages in the United States are \$2.57 per head as compared to 52 cents in Australia. We buy our materials from companies manufacturing and distributing under American wage-rate conditions and we pay out \$5.43 per year for materials where Australia pays 88 cents per head. All in all it totals up that the cash outlay for an American woolgrower to raise one sheep is \$9.87 per head per year while Australia can do this for \$1.95. It is no wonder that foreign producers can ship half way around the world, pay this State Department lowered wool tariff and still undersell the American grower. The next table shows the labor requirements of the wool industry as compared to cattle ranches in both the intermountain region and the northern plains regions of the United States. When this is coupled with the next table showing the production you can understand that technological advances just cannot lower the labor costs of wool production as they can in other lines of farm production. For instance, the amount of production per man in sheep range country is almost identical with production per unit in 1930. But on corn belt farms the output per man has increased 37 to 42 percent and in the north central areas and in the Dakotas, output per man in wheat production is up 33 to 66 percent.

Average prices received by farmers per pound of shorn wool and per hundredweight of sheep, lambs, and beef cattle, United States, 1909-52

Year	Wool per pound	Sheep per hundred-weight	Lambs per hundred-weight	Beef cattle per hundred-weight
1910	21.7	\$4.99	\$6.16	\$4.86
1911	15.8	4.01	5.17	4.57
1912	17.3	4.25	5.62	5.43
1913	16.7	4.52	5.99	6.20
1914	16.6	4.83	6.36	6.52
1915	22.1	5.30	6.98	6.26
1916	26.1	6.28	8.34	6.76
1917	41.6	9.58	12.71	8.54
1918	57.7	10.75	13.96	9.88
1919	49.5	9.26	12.83	9.97
1920	45.5	8.17	11.64	8.71
1921	17.3	4.55	7.13	5.63
1922	27.1	5.96	9.90	5.73
1923	39.4	6.55	10.52	5.84
1924	36.6	6.57	10.80	5.84
1925	39.5	7.56	12.40	6.53
1926	34.0	7.20	11.70	6.75
1927	30.3	7.01	11.50	7.62
1928	36.2	7.65	12.20	9.52
1929	30.2	7.19	11.90	9.47
1930	19.5	4.74	7.76	7.71
1931	13.6	3.11	5.64	5.53
1932	8.6	2.24	4.47	4.25
1933	20.6	2.38	5.04	3.75

Average prices received by farmers per pound of shorn wool and per hundredweight of sheep, lambs, and beef cattle, United States, 1909-52—Continued

Year	Wool per pound	Sheep per hundred-weight	Lambs per hundred-weight	Beef cattle per hundred-weight
	<i>Cents</i>			
1934	21.9	\$2.85	\$5.90	\$4.13
1935	19.3	3.75	7.28	6.04
1936	26.9	3.77	8.05	5.82
1937	32.0	4.52	8.88	7.00
1938	19.1	3.58	7.05	6.54
1939	22.3	3.90	7.78	7.14
1940	28.4	3.95	8.10	7.56
1941	35.5	5.06	9.88	8.82
1942	40.1	5.80	11.70	10.70
1943	41.6	6.57	13.00	11.99
1944	42.3	6.01	12.50	10.80
1945	41.9	6.38	13.10	12.10
1946	42.3	7.48	15.60	14.50
1947	42.0	8.39	20.50	18.40
1948	49.2	9.69	22.80	22.20
1949	49.4	9.27	22.40	19.80
1950	62.1	11.60	25.10	23.30
1951	97.0	16.00	31.00	28.70
1952 <sup>1</sup>	53.3	10.10	24.30	24.30

<sup>1</sup> Preliminary.  
Source: Bureau of Agricultural Economics.

Indexes of prices received by farmers for wool and prices paid by farmers, taxes and wage rates

Year	Wool prices	Wage rates	Prices paid for production and living items	Farm real estate taxes per acre
[1935-39=100]				
1935	82	88	99	98
1936	112	94	99	99
1937	128	106	105	99
1938	82	107	99	103
1939	96	105	98	102
1940	120	106	99	104
1941	147	124	105	103
1942	166	162	120	104
1943	172	216	133	102
1944	174	262	141	102
1945	173	296	145	105
1946	176	319	159	117
1947	175	345	186	130
1948	197	364	202	151
1949	209	354	194	164
1950	255	350	199	176
1951	371	387	219	184
1952	226	414	221	194
1953	222	423	212	204

Total and hired labor required and cost of hired labor on family-operated sheep and cattle ranches with specified numbers of livestock in the intermountain region and northern plains, 1930-52

Year	SHEEP RANCHES					
	Intermountain region <sup>13</sup>			Northern Plains <sup>14</sup>		
	Labor required		Cost of hired labor	Labor required		Cost of hired labor
	Total	Hired		Total	Hired	
	<i>Days</i>	<i>Days</i>	<i>Dollars</i>	<i>Days</i>	<i>Days</i>	<i>Dollars</i>
1930	1,034	500	1,525	854	401.5	916
1931	1,032	504	1,382	852	393.0	800
1932	1,014	492	872	770	305.4	475
1933	1,004	485	674	920	455.2	587
1934	998	485	771	878	416.3	507
1935	955	448	787	647	191.6	343
1936	964	460	880	705	253.4	449
1937	972	471	998	625	201.9	344

<sup>13</sup> Ranches with 500 to 3,100 head of all sheep—usually about 1,400 head of stock sheep.  
<sup>14</sup> Ranches with 300 to 3,100 head of all sheep—usually about 1,000 head of stock sheep.  
<sup>15</sup> Ranches with 50 to 600 head of all cattle—usually about 100 head of breeding cows.  
<sup>16</sup> Ranches with 40 to 600 head of all cattle—usually about 80 head of breeding cows.

Total and hired labor required and cost of hired labor on family-operated sheep and cattle ranches with specified numbers of livestock in the intermountain region and northern plains, 1930-52—Continued

Year	SHEEP RANCHES—continued					
	Intermountain region			Northern Plains		
	Labor required		Cost of hired labor	Labor required		Cost of hired labor
	Total	Hired		Total	Hired	
	<i>Days</i>	<i>Days</i>	<i>Dollars</i>	<i>Days</i>	<i>Days</i>	<i>Dollars</i>
1938	974	476	594	638	224.5	449
1939	975	480	1,014	669	296.9	530
1940	950	467	1,011	653	257.1	530
1941	962	488	1,276	699	308.7	509
1942	945	459	1,739	741	330.6	924
1943	941	500	2,403	812	416.5	1,459
1944	940	517	2,950	751	354.7	1,533
1945	944	539	3,391	721	316.2	1,786
1946	951	546	3,775	737	311.4	1,678
1947	983	581	4,395	710	273.7	1,564
1948	1,007	602	4,755	760	325.5	2,024
1949	1,007	596	4,650	765	320.7	2,113
1950	986	578	4,524	755	317.3	2,062
1951	1,009	601	5,702	761	329.0	2,575
1952	1,036	628	5,491	819	368.8	3,013

Year	CATTLE RANCHES					
	Total	Hired	Total	Hired	Total	Hired
1930	531	0	515	104.4	219	55
1931	567	39	72	427	29.4	55
1932	573	51	59	492	91.3	125
1933	577	58	52	523	124.1	138
1934	579	66	67	400	26.5	26
1935	523	16	18	408	33.0	47
1936	512	8	10	364	16.2	23
1937	488	0	381	21.9	28	28
1938	476	0	406	38.5	62	75
1939	497	2	3	410	46.0	75
1940	476	0	415	52.8	88	88
1941	501	27	45	450	89.1	140
1942	509	53	122	466	100.5	221
1943	519	78	240	471	102.8	317
1944	512	89	332	485	107.9	416
1945	505	100	412	458	87.0	452
1946	485	80	363	441	79.4	382
1947	471	69	345	444	83.1	409
1948	465	60	375	427	76.6	421
1949	500	92	563	428	75.1	438
1950	459	51	352	429	76.3	439
1951	469	67	513	436	84.1	595
1952	462	60	489	437	91.5	666

Source: Bureau of Agricultural Economics.  
Production per unit of input on selected types of commercial family-operated farms and ranches, 1930-33, 1939-42, and 1949-52<sup>1</sup>  
[Index numbers, 1930-33=100]

Type and location of farms	Production per unit of input		
	1930-33	1939-42	1949-52
Sheep ranches:			
Intermountain region	100	167	96
Northern Plains	100	107	100
Cattle ranches:			
Intermountain region	100	100	93
Northern Plains	100	97	90
Corn Belt farms:			
Hog-beef raising	100	118	137
Cash grain	100	134	142
Dairy farms:			
Western Wisconsin	100	104	107
Eastern Wisconsin	100	112	115
Wheat farms:			
Eastern Dakotas	100	70	133
Northern central North Dakota	100	159	166

<sup>1</sup> This is a measure of changes in efficiency in production showing the change since the predrought period of 1930-33 in production obtained per unit of all factors used in production. It was derived by dividing the value of total production by the value of all factors used in production, each in terms of constant dollar values.  
NOTE.—Due to the very nature of the industry, there are limitations to the extent sheep ranchers can increase their efficiency of production. Technological advances which have increased the efficiency of crop farmers and of livestock farmers who rely primarily on harvested feeds have not been effective in the semiarid range areas of the West.

Roughage-consuming livestock: Animal units fed in year beginning Oct. 1, 13 range sheep States, native sheep States, and United States, 1919-20 to 1952-53

Year beginning Oct. 1	[In thousands of units]		
	13 range sheep States	Native sheep States	United States
1919-20	26,577	49,714	76,291
1920-21	26,148	48,618	74,766
1921-22	26,034	48,537	74,571
1922-23	25,639	48,054	73,693
1923-24	25,392	47,399	72,791
1924-25	24,952	46,194	71,146
1925-26	24,292	45,051	69,343
1926-27	23,852	43,872	67,724
1927-28	23,871	43,366	67,237
1928-29	24,333	43,821	68,154
1929-30	24,863	44,492	69,355
1930-31	25,426	45,311	70,737
1931-32	25,591	46,685	72,276
1932-33	26,497	48,131	74,628
1933-34	27,346	49,610	77,356
1934-35	25,722	47,290	72,613
1935-36	24,933	46,401	71,334
1936-37	24,858	44,830	69,688
1937-38	24,223	44,133	68,356
1938-39	23,783	44,408	68,191
1939-40	24,487	45,576	70,063
1940-41	25,321	46,837	72,158
1941-42	26,734	48,481	75,215
1942-43	27,709	50,497	78,206
1943-44	28,176	51,768	79,944
1944-45	27,660	51,066	78,726
1945-46	26,624	48,630	75,254
1946-47	25,305	47,196	72,501
1947-48	24,262	44,747	69,009
1948-49	23,427	43,766	67,193
1949-50	23,171	44,063	67,234
1950-51	24,116	45,191	69,307
1951-52	25,122	47,104	72,226
1952-53	25,686	49,436	75,122

Source: Bureau of Agricultural Economics.  
Comparisons, sheep operations, intermountain area, United States, and New South Wales, Australia, 1948-49

	United States	Australia
Cash costs per sheep		
Wages and contracts	\$2.57	\$0.52
Shearing and crutching	.44	.12
Materials	5.43	.88
Stock charges		.01
Rates and taxes	.84	.09
Insurance		.04
Wool selling costs		.16
Cartage		.05
Miscellaneous expense	.50	.08
Total cash costs	9.87	1.95
Noncash costs		
Depreciation	.54	.19
Total cash and noncash	10.41	2.14

There has been a great deal of comment by proponents of this measure S. 2911, stating that tariff increases were sure to put wool in a bad position in competing with other fibers. That simply is not true. The junior Senator from Nevada requested the Department of Agriculture to provide him with figures showing what it would have meant if the President had accepted the Tariff Commission recommendation last month and added 10 cents a clean pound additional duty on wool. The Department informed the junior Senator from Nevada that even by pyramiding the costs through profits at each stage of the manufacturing and distributing that it would make about \$1 difference in the price of a suit of clothes. Less than 17 percent of the price on a suit of clothes goes for the raw material, so 10 cents a pound additional duty would not affect consumer purchases. In order to show this more fully I have 2 tables, 1 showing the mill consumption of cotton, wool, rayon and acetate, and other man-made fibers, plus flax and silk in the United States from 1921 to 1952. The next table shows the per capita mill consumption of these fibers during those same years. Understand, of course,

that the war years are distorted because cotton and wool and other materials were going into military consumption rather than civil-

ian requirements. What this does show is a very outstanding answer to those who say that synthetics are threatening to wipe out

the wool industry. This shows that wool consumption is higher per capita today than it was in the prewar years.

Mill consumption of cotton, wool, rayon and acetate, other man-made fiber, flax, and silk, United States, 1921-52

[In millions of pounds]

Year	Cotton <sup>1</sup>	Wool <sup>2</sup>			Rayon and acetate <sup>3</sup>	Other man-made <sup>4</sup>	Flax <sup>4</sup>	Silk <sup>5</sup>	Total
		Apparel	Carpet	Total					
1921	2,600.6	299.7	43.7	343.4	19.8		8.8	51.8	3,024.4
1922	2,911.3	312.8	93.7	406.5	24.7		12.2	57.8	3,412.5
1923	3,122.6	311.3	111.1	422.4	32.5		15.4	61.5	3,654.4
1924	2,636.5	249.7	92.5	342.2	42.2		8.5	59.6	3,089.0
1925	3,075.3	251.7	98.2	349.9	58.2		12.6	76.0	3,572.0
1926	3,213.5	254.7	88.0	342.7	60.6		16.2	76.9	3,709.9
1927	3,590.1	258.7	95.4	354.1	100.0		11.4	85.0	4,140.6
1928	3,187.0	232.4	100.8	333.2	100.5		13.6	87.2	3,721.5
1929	3,425.3	253.2	114.9	368.1	133.4		14.0	96.8	4,037.6
1930	2,616.6	200.7	62.5	263.2	118.8		15.6	80.6	3,094.8
1931	2,654.9	237.7	73.3	311.0	158.9		7.2	87.5	3,219.5
1932	2,463.7	188.5	41.6	230.1	155.3		7.8	74.8	2,931.7
1933	3,050.7	245.5	71.6	317.1	217.2		10.2	70.4	3,665.6
1934	2,659.5	167.6	62.1	229.7	196.9		10.9	60.4	3,157.4
1935	2,755.4	319.0	98.5	417.5	259.1		12.6	72.4	3,517.0
1936	3,471.4	299.8	106.3	406.1	322.4		13.1	67.5	4,280.5
1937	3,646.6	274.2	106.6	380.8	304.7		14.2	64.2	4,410.5
1938	2,918.3	219.6	64.9	284.5	329.4		3.9	57.1	3,593.2
1939	3,628.6	293.1	103.4	396.5	458.8		14.4	55.3	4,553.6
1940	3,959.1	310.0	97.9	407.9	482.0	5.0	12.1	47.6	4,913.7
1941	5,192.1	514.4	133.6	648.0	591.8	12.0	9.7	25.6	6,479.2
1942	5,633.1	560.5	43.1	603.6	620.8	21.0	23.0	0.2	6,904.7
1943	5,270.6	603.3	32.9	636.2	656.1	38.0	13.6	( <sup>6</sup> )	6,614.5
1944	4,790.4	577.0	45.8	622.8	704.8	48.0	9.5	( <sup>6</sup> )	6,175.5
1945	4,515.8	589.2	55.9	645.1	769.9	51.0	7.4	1.0	5,990.2
1946	4,809.1	609.6	127.9	737.5	875.5	56.0	12.6	13.5	6,504.2
1947	4,665.6	525.9	172.3	698.2	987.9	50.0	8.8	3.2	6,413.7
1948	4,463.5	485.2	207.9	693.1	1,149.6	72.0	5.5	7.4	6,391.1
1949	3,839.1	339.0	161.4	500.4	993.4	92.0	6.1	4.0	5,435.0
1950	4,682.7	436.9	197.9	634.8	1,351.4	141.0	10.9	10.5	6,831.3
1951	4,850.4	382.1	102.0	484.1	1,276.1	205.0	11.1	7.2	6,833.9
1952 <sup>7</sup>	4,482.6	346.8	119.6	466.4	1,214.7	257.8	6.7	12.6	6,440.8

<sup>1</sup> Mill consumption as reported by the Bureau of the Census. For American cotton, tare of 22 pounds was deducted from gross weight of bale produced through 1923; for 1924 and thereafter tare as reported by the Crop Reporting Board has been deducted. For foreign cotton, 3 percent (15 pounds) was deducted.

<sup>2</sup> Mill consumption, scoured basis, as reported by the Bureau of the Census.

<sup>3</sup> Domestic shipments plus imports for consumption as published in Textile Organon.

<sup>4</sup> Imports and estimated production as reported by the Bureau of the Census, Bureau of Plant Industry, and Portland, Oreg., office of Bureau of Agricultural Economics.

<sup>5</sup> Net imports through 1933; imports for consumption as reported by the Bureau of the Census for 1934 and thereafter.

<sup>6</sup> Less than 50,000 pounds.

<sup>7</sup> Preliminary.

Per capita mill consumption of cotton, wool, rayon, and acetate, other man-made fiber, flax, and silk, United States, 1921-52

Year	Cotton <sup>1</sup>	Wool <sup>2</sup>			Rayon and acetate <sup>3</sup>	Other man-made <sup>4</sup>	Flax <sup>4</sup>	Silk <sup>5</sup>	Total
		Apparel	Carpet	Total					
	<i>Pounds</i>	<i>Pounds</i>	<i>Pounds</i>	<i>Pounds</i>	<i>Pounds</i>	<i>Pounds</i>	<i>Pounds</i>	<i>Pounds</i>	<i>Pounds</i>
1921	23.62	2.72	0.40	3.12	0.18		0.08	0.47	27.47
1922	26.09	2.80	.84	3.64	.22		.11	.52	30.58
1923	27.51	2.74	.98	3.72	.29		.14	.54	32.20
1924	22.79	2.16	.80	2.96	.36		.07	.52	26.70
1925	26.17	2.14	.84	2.98	.50		.11	.65	30.41
1926	27.00	2.14	.74	2.88	.51		.14	.65	31.18
1927	29.74	2.14	.79	2.93	.83		.09	.70	34.29
1928	26.08	1.90	.82	2.72	.82		.11	.71	30.44
1929	27.74	2.05	.93	2.98	1.08		.11	.78	32.69
1930	20.97	1.61	.50	2.11	.95		.13	.65	24.81
1931	21.10	1.89	.58	2.47	1.26		.06	.70	25.59
1932	19.46	1.49	.33	1.82	1.23		.06	.59	23.16
1933	23.96	1.93	.56	2.49	1.71		.08	.55	28.79
1934	20.76	1.31	.48	1.79	1.54		.09	.47	24.65
1935	21.36	2.47	.76	3.23	2.01		.10	.56	27.26
1936	26.74	2.31	.82	3.13	2.48		.10	.52	32.97
1937	27.92	2.10	.82	2.92	2.33		.11	.49	33.77
1938	22.18	1.67	.49	2.16	2.50		.03	.43	27.30
1939	27.34	2.21	.78	2.99	3.46		.11	.42	34.32
1940	29.55	2.31	.73	3.04	3.60	0.04	.09	.36	36.68
1941	38.37	3.80	.99	4.79	4.37	.09	.07	.19	47.88
1942	41.21	4.10	.32	4.42	4.54	.18	.17	( <sup>6</sup> )	50.52
1943	38.03	4.35	.24	4.59	4.73	.27	.10	( <sup>6</sup> )	47.72
1944	34.14	4.11	.33	4.44	5.02	.34	.07	( <sup>6</sup> )	44.01
1945	31.85	4.16	.39	4.55	5.43	.36	.05	.01	42.25
1946	33.54	4.25	.89	5.14	6.11	.39	.09	.09	45.36
1947	31.93	3.60	1.18	4.78	6.76	.34	.06	.02	43.89
1948	30.02	3.26	1.40	4.66	7.73	.48	.04	.05	42.98
1949	25.37	2.24	1.07	3.31	6.57	.61	.04	.03	35.93
1950	30.45	2.84	1.29	4.13	8.79	.92	.07	.07	44.43
1951	30.99	2.44	.65	3.09	8.15	1.31	.07	.05	43.66
1952 <sup>7</sup>	28.16	2.18	.75	2.93	7.63	1.62	.04	.08	40.46

<sup>1</sup> Mill consumption as reported by the Bureau of the Census. For American cotton, tare of 22 pounds was deducted from gross weight of bale produced through 1923; for 1924 and thereafter tare as reported by the Crop Reporting Board has been deducted. For foreign cotton, 3 percent (15 pounds) was deducted.

<sup>2</sup> Mill consumption, scoured basis, as reported by the Bureau of the Census.

<sup>3</sup> Domestic shipments plus imports for consumption as published in Textile Organon.

<sup>4</sup> Imports and estimated production as reported by the Bureau of the Census, Bureau of Plant Industry, and Portland, Oreg., office of Bureau of Agricultural Economics.

<sup>5</sup> Net imports through 1933; imports for consumption as reported by the Bureau of the Census for 1934 and thereafter.

<sup>6</sup> Less than 0.005 pounds.

<sup>7</sup> Preliminary.

I sincerely hope the Members of this body will study this material being presented today. It is self-evident that the proper solution to the problem of the wool industry is one of this Government providing a flexible tariff protection for the American producers on the basis of fair and reasonable competition. Give these foreign producers every right to come in and compete in our market with our American labor and producers on a fair basis, but, stop this unfair competition. We talk about helping foreign countries and then make our foreign trade policy one which pays a premium to the lowest wage peon labor countries because they can take the American market while they throw our workers out of jobs.

I repeat that the wool industry is in serious trouble. It is true that S. 2911, as introduced, is a better support program, but there is no need for a support program of any kind for wool if the Congress will adopt this substitute amendment.

I cannot recognize the validity of the argument that the national security requires us to adopt methods of helping the industry through other means than raising the tariff. There is much more validity in this amendment I am proposing which says simply that the United States Government has the right to assure protection for the American producers of a critical and essential war material such as wool.

The Constitution pointedly separates the regulation of the domestic economy and the foreign policy. It directed the legislative branch of our Government to regulate the domestic economy and the executive branch to fix the foreign policy.

It is time for the Congress to reassume its responsibility as set out in article I, section 8 of the Constitution, to regulate foreign trade for the benefit of our Nation and to adjust the duties, imposts, and excises, which we call tariffs. This amendment proposes to do that. We have a known clear-cut case in the situation on wool, and it is time for us to stand up and be counted.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico is recognized for 3 minutes.

#### LOCATION OF THE AIR ACADEMY

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I do not desire to use this time to speak in opposition to the amendment.

I am anxious to get into the RECORD a statement of the fact that we in New Mexico have had a considerable disappointment regarding the location of the new Air Academy.

When the bill authorizing the academy was under discussion, it was understood that all parts of the country would have an opportunity to participate in the presentation of their proposals for the location of the Air Academy.

However, the Secretary for Air has advised one of the communities in my State that it did not have what he called "a Chinaman's chance" in connection with the location of the Air Academy, since it is too far from a metropolitan area; and that no location would be considered as acceptable unless it was near a metropolitan area of 250,000 persons or more.

Mr. President, that rules out the States of Montana, Idaho, Kansas, Wyoming, New Mexico, Arizona, Utah, Nevada, Ar-

kansas, Oklahoma, North Dakota, and South Dakota as possible sites. Those are States that I think are ideal as possibilities for the location of the Air Academy. I think it is as wrong as can be for the Secretary for Air to decide that a community of 250,000 persons is required for the Air Academy.

Mr. President, the Scripps-Howard newspaper in my home community, the Albuquerque Tribune, published, a day or two ago, an editorial entitled "A Good Question." In the editorial the Albuquerque Tribune asks why it is necessary to have a metropolitan area of 250,000 near the Air Academy. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### A GOOD QUESTION

Ruth Finney, Tribune Washington correspondent, reported yesterday that no location for the new Air Force Academy will be considered unless it is near a metropolitan area of 250,000 or more population.

Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON said that Secretary of Air Harold E. Talbott had given this information to Mayor Noel McDade of Clayton.

Senator ANDERSON is asking Secretary Talbott why, if this is true, this qualification was not set forth in the criteria published by the Air Force on April 6.

We think this is a very good question. If all New Mexico sites were excluded from consideration automatically it was an injustice to permit them to go to the trouble and expense of preparing brochures to support their bids for the Academy.

We think another very good question is why it is necessary to have a metropolitan area of 250,000 near the Air Academy. That would eliminate all locations in the far Southwest, the best area from the standpoint of year-around flying weather.

We doubt seriously that successful operation of a school to train Air Force officers would require proximity to a city of a quarter million people.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, there is some argument as to whether the information supplied me, in reference to the statement by the Secretary for Air, was correct. Just today a resident of Clayton, N. Mex., who was present when the mayor of Clayton had a telephone conversation with the Secretary for Air, was in this area, and telephoned me. His name is D. D. Monroe. He is a well-known businessman of Clayton, and he was on the telephone when the mayor of Clayton was talking to the Secretary for Air. Mr. Monroe assures me that the mayor correctly quoted the Secretary for Air as saying that no community in a situation similar to that of Clayton, N. Mex., will have "a Chinaman's chance" to have the Air Academy located there.

Mr. Monroe is a highly respected citizen. He is on his way to a world convention of an organization to which he belongs. He has been active in many organizations. I know he is highly regarded by his community, and that the testimony he gave me over the telephone must be correct.

Mr. President, I say it is wrong for the Secretary for Air to reach a decision that

would disqualify many of the western States because they do not have within their borders a town of 250,000 persons.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the body of the RECORD three letters, one being my letter under date of April 20 to Hon. Harold E. Talbott, Secretary of the Air Force; the second being his short reply to me, under date of April 22, and the third being his letter of April 22 to the mayor of Clayton, N. Mex.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APRIL 20, 1954.

HON. HAROLD E. TALBOTT,  
Secretary, Department of the Air Force,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I have just received a copy of a letter which Noel McDade, mayor of Clayton, N. Mex., addressed to you in regard to the Air Academy. In it he quotes from a telephone conversation with you and reports you as stating you did not think Clayton had a Chinaman's chance since it is too far removed from a metropolitan area and that no location would be acceptable or considered unless it was near or approximate to a metropolitan area of 250,000 or more.

It just so happened that I was in Albuquerque and did not know that a copy of the above letter had been received in my office. I had wired my administrative assistant, Claude Wood, requesting that he make inquiry as early as possible to determine whether or not the Commission on the Air Academy sites actually plans to inspect sites in New Mexico, and if so, when and which site.

Of course if it is the intention of the Commission to consider only metropolitan areas of 250,000 then none of the sites in New Mexico are to be considered. If this is the case, I am wondering why this was not set forth in the criteria published in your release of April 6, 1954. No mention is made of such a factor as the requirement of a community to have 250,000 population in order to be considered. Every indication all along has been that any community desiring to make application and submit material showing its desirability would be given equal consideration. This I have interpreted as meaning if a community meets the published criteria, due consideration would be given and that would include an inspection of the site. How else could equal consideration be given to each community if an inspection is not given to each area meeting the criteria?

Mr. Wood advises me that he talked with Colonel Box, of your office, this morning, and that Colonel Box could not advise what, if any, inspections are to be made in New Mexico. He referred Mr. Wood to General Harmon who is a member of the Commission.

General Harmon advised Mr. Wood that he could not say whether or not any inspections would be made in New Mexico. When asked who could say, General Harmon stated only the Commission could decide that and that the members were in recess and that he could not advise when they would meet again. Mr. Wood requested that I be advised when the Commission planned to meet again. I would like to repeat that request now.

From all appearances, this matter has been handled in a manner that is very misleading to many small communities in the country. Many of them are vitally interested in the Air Academy and are entitled to be considered unless they are barred by the criteria

established and published. Many communities in New Mexico have gone to considerable expense and work in preparation of brochures and material for presentation in hope that they will be given equal consideration. There is a growing feeling in the communities in New Mexico that they have been misled and that actually it was never intended that they be considered other than to let them present brochures and for the Commission to go through the motions of considering them. If that is true, it would be very unfair to these communities, for it would have been much better that they had never presented an application or request than to lead them to believe that they were to be given equal consideration.

In view of the communications I have had from communities in New Mexico, I would like to know if inspections are actually going to be made of sites that have been submitted by the various cities in New Mexico. If inspections are not going to be made of all sites in New Mexico, can you advise me if inspections are to be made of any sites in New Mexico? If so, I would like to be advised in advance which site is to be inspected and the date of inspection.

There is nothing I can add to the material that has been presented by those communities in New Mexico requesting consideration except to say that New Mexico, from the standpoint of the criteria published on April 6, 1954, is without question one of the most desirable locations in the United States for the Air Academy. I believe that we have many advantages over any other State and that we are entitled to equal consideration.

I would like to be advised at once if there are additional unpublished requirements that are not set forth in the release No. 297-54 of April 6, 1954.

Sincerely yours,

CLINTON P. ANDERSON.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE,  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,  
Washington, April 22, 1954.

HON. CLINTON P. ANDERSON,  
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR ANDERSON: I received your letter of April 20 and I also received a letter from Mayor McDade, of Clayton, N. Mex.

Enclosed is a copy of my letter to Mayor McDade. I believe that this letter might give you the information you would like to have in connection with your letter to me.

Sincerely yours,

H. E. TALBOTT.

[Enclosure.]

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE,  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,  
Washington, April 22, 1954.

HON. NOEL MCDADE,  
Mayor of the Town of Clayton,  
Clayton, N. Mex.

DEAR MAYOR MCDADE: This is in reply to the letter which you, Mr. Kirby and Mr. Edmondson sent to me on April 12. As you know, I have appointed a commission of five men to advise me in the matter of selecting a site for the Air Force Academy. If the Commission reaches unanimous agreement on a permanent location for the Academy, I am obliged by law to accept their choice. If their report is not unanimous, I must choose from among their top three recommendations.

When the Commission first met here in Washington all the material submitted by your committee as well as the data on some 500 other sites in 45 States were made available to them. I believe that the Commission made a wise move when it decided to set up certain basic criteria regarding the most desirable attributes of an ideal site. The Commission was then able to screen and evaluate the large number of potential sites against the background of its agreed-upon criteria and to establish some order of priority among the possible locations. Needless to say, it is

impossible for this Commission to examine each of the 500 suggested sites. The Commission makes their own decision as to which sites they shall inspect. They have taken a very conscientious approach to the problem and I am confident that their final decision will be highly acceptable to the American people.

Every site which has been suggested must stand or fall on its own merits when it is evaluated by the very able group of men on the commission.

Sincerely yours,

HAROLD E. TALBOTT.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, finally, I wish to say that anyone who will read the letter I wrote to the Secretary for Air and will read his reply to me will realize that he has not been very specific about the matter. He now tells me that the Commission to select a site will reconvene on the 28th. If it does, I hope the first thing it will do is rescind its decision that a community has to have a population of 250,000 before it will be considered as proper for the location of the Air Academy.

There is not a community in the State of the distinguished Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], who has just spoken, which would qualify. The Senators from North Dakota and the Senators from South Dakota supported this legislation. Both Senators from South Dakota will recognize that the Air Force has a fine installation at Rapid City, S. Dak., but that city would not qualify under this rule.

The State of Oklahoma is ruled out, because, according to the last census, Oklahoma City has a population of only 240,000. I suppose if the principle of growth could be applied to it, by now it might claim a sufficient population to qualify it, but because the census is against it, an entire State like Oklahoma can be eliminated. The authorities can say, "This is no place for an Air Academy."

Fortunately—or unfortunately, depending upon one's viewpoint—the State of Nebraska has a community with a population of 253,000. That makes Nebraska eligible.

I think the rule is a very poor one, and, in my judgment, the Department of Air had better get rid of it as quickly as possible.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from New Mexico has expired.

#### DEVELOPMENT OF THE DOMESTIC WOOL INDUSTRY

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2911) to provide for the development of a sound and profitable domestic wool industry under our national policy of expanding world trade, to encourage increased domestic production of wool for our national security, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], in the nature of a substitute.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I think the distinguished senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] would permit me to say that a point of order might

possibly be raised against the amendment of the Senator from Nevada. I have no desire to raise it, and I am sure the Senator from Vermont has no such desire. We agree with the Senator from Nevada that the tariff is a desirable way of handling this problem. We also know that it cannot work in this particular instance because, apparently, the decision has been reached at a high level that such a measure would not be supported. While many of us have expressed our interest in the tariff as a remedy, and may be quite impressed by the suggestion of the Senator from Nevada with reference to the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, which will be before us later for consideration, I hope the pending amendment may be defeated at this time.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield for a question?

Mr. ANDERSON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MALONE. Does the distinguished Senator from New Mexico believe that the Congress should be guided in distributing its constitutional responsibility among other departments of the Government by an idea coming from the Executive?

Mr. ANDERSON. No. We have discussed that question, and I have had to agree with the Senator that the Congress should not abdicate its responsibilities. However, I think I should also agree with him that the time to reach a decision on that question is when the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act is before the House and Senate for action looking to its extension.

Mr. MALONE. It is now before the Senate.

Mr. ANDERSON. I realize that, but I desire very much to see the pending bill pass without amendment.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I realize that probably a point of order could be made against the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada. I do not desire to raise such a point of order, however.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Twenty-three minutes remain.

Mr. AIKEN. I yield the remainder of my time in opposition to the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE].

Mr. MALONE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Alken	Daniel	Hennings
Anderson	Dirksen	Hickenlooper
Barrett	Douglas	Hill
Beall	Duff	Hoey
Bennett	Dworshak	Holland
Bowring	Eastland	Humphrey
Bricker	Ellender	Ives
Bridges	Ferguson	Jackson
Burke	Flanders	Jenner
Bush	Frear	Johnson, Colo.
Butler, Nebr.	Fulbright	Johnson, Tex.
Carlson	Gillette	Johnston, S. C.
Case	Gore	Kerr
Clements	Green	Knowland
Cooper	Hayden	Kuchel
Cordon	Hendrickson	Langer

Long	Mundt	Smith, N. J.
Magnuson	Murray	Sparkman
Malone	Neely	Stennis
Mansfield	Pastore	Symington
Martin	Payne	Thye
Maybank	Potter	Upton
McCarran	Purtell	Watkins
McCarthy	Robertson	Welker
McClellan	Saltonstall	Wiley
Millikin	Schoepfel	Williams
Monroney	Smathers	Young
Morse	Smith, Maine	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment, in the nature of a substitute, offered by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE].

The amendment was, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

That as used in this act the term "strategic and critical wool and mohair" means wool and mohair and any products processed therefrom, which are determined to be strategic or critical under section 2 (a) of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stockpiling Act.

SEC. 2. It is declared to be the policy of the Congress to develop and promote the production of strategic and critical wool and mohair within the United States so that such wool and mohair will be available to the Nation in time of war and to relieve the United States from dependency upon foreign areas for such strategic and critical wool and mohair, the transportation of which in time of war would be difficult or impossible. It is necessary and essential that a proper economic climate be created or exist to encourage the development and production of our strategic and critical wool and mohair. Such economic climate would enable the United States to maintain a going concern critical wool and mohair industry within the United States in time of peace which can supply the Nation with such strategic and critical wool and mohair in time of war. To create such favorable economic climate and to accomplish the other objectives of this act it will be necessary to reestablish a principle in the regulation of import duties on strategic and critical wool and mohair to provide for fair and reasonable competition between foreign producers and domestic producers.

SEC. 3. (a) There is hereby created a Strategic and Critical Wool and Mohair Authority, to be composed of the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of the Treasury, and the Chairman of the United States Tariff Commission (hereinafter referred to as the Authority), which shall have the powers conferred by this act with respect to any strategic and critical wool and mohair whenever the Authority certifies that such strategic and critical wool and mohair requires relief as authorized herein.

(b) The Authority may, subject to the civil-service laws, appoint such employees as it deems necessary to carry out its functions under this act and shall fix their compensation in accordance with the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

(c) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

SEC. 4. All powers vested in, delegated to, or otherwise properly exercisable by the President or any other officer or agency of the United States in respect to the foreign trade agreements entered into pursuant to section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, insofar as they relate to strategic and critical wool and mohair, are hereby transferred to, and shall be exercisable by the Authority, including but not limited to, the right to invoke the various escape clauses, reservations, and options therein contained, and to exercise on behalf of the United States any rights

or privileges therein provided for the protection of the interests of the United States.

SEC. 5. (a) The Authority is authorized and directed from time to time, and subject to the limitations herein provided, to prescribe and establish import duties upon strategic and critical wool and mohair, which will provide for fair and reasonable competition between domestic articles and like or similar foreign articles in the principal market or markets of the United States. A foreign article shall be considered as providing fair and reasonable competition to United States producers of a like or similar article if the Authority finds as a fact that the landed duty paid price of the foreign article in the principal market or markets in the United States is a fair price, including a reasonable profit to the importers, and is not substantially below the price, including a reasonable profit for domestic producers, at which the like or similar domestic articles can be offered to consumers of the same class by the domestic industry in the principal market or markets in the United States.

(b) In determining whether the landed duty paid price of a foreign article, including a fair profit for the importers, is, and may continue to be, a fair price under subdivision (a) of this section, the Authority shall take into consideration, insofar as it finds practicable—

(1) the lowest, highest, average, and median landed duty paid price of the article from foreign countries offering substantial competition;

(2) Any change that may occur or may reasonably be expected in the exchange rates of foreign countries either by reason of devaluation or because of a serious unbalance of international payments;

(3) the policy of foreign countries designed substantially to increase exports to the United States by selling at unreasonably low and uneconomic prices to secure additional dollar credits;

(4) increases or decreases of domestic production and of imports on the basis of both unit volume of articles produced and articles imported, and the respective percentages of each;

(5) the actual and potential future ration of volume and value of imports to volume and value of production, respectively;

(6) the probable extent and duration of changes in production costs and practices; and

(7) the degree to which normal cost relationships may be affected by grants, subsidies (effected through multiple rates of export exchange, or otherwise), excises, export taxes, or other taxes, or otherwise, in the country of origin; and any other factors either in the United States or in other countries which appear likely to affect production costs and competitive relationships.

(c) Decreases or increases in import duties designed to provide for fair and reasonable competition between foreign and domestic articles may be made by the Authority either upon its own motion or upon application of any person or group showing adequate and proper interest in the import duties in question: *Provided, however,* That no change in any import duty shall be ordered by the Authority until after it shall have first conducted a full investigation and presented tentative proposals followed by a public hearing at which interested parties have an opportunity to be heard.

(d) The Authority, in setting import duties so as to establish fair and reasonable competition as herein provided, may, in order to effectuate the purposes of this act, prescribe specific duties or ad valorem rates of duty upon the foreign value or export value as defined in sections 402 (c) and 402 (d) of the Tariff Act of 1930 or upon the United States value as defined in section 402 (e) of said act.

(e) In order to carry out the purposes of this act, the Authority is authorized to trans-

fer any article from the dutiable list to the free list, or from the free list to the dutiable list.

(f) Any increase or decrease in import duties ordered by the Authority shall become effective 90 days after such order is announced: *Provided,* That any such order is first submitted to Congress by the Authority and is not disapproved, in whole or in part, by concurrent resolution of Congress within 60 days thereafter.

(g) No order shall be announced by the Authority under this section which increases existing import duties on foreign articles if the Authority finds as a fact that the domestic industry operates, or the domestic article is produced, in a wasteful, inefficient, or extravagant manner.

(h) The Authority, in the manner provided for in subdivisions (c) and (f) in this section, may impose quantitative limits on the importation of any foreign article, in such amounts, and for such periods, as it finds necessary in order to effectuate the purposes of this act: *Provided, however,* That no such quantitative limit shall be imposed contrary to the provisions of any foreign-trade agreement in effect pursuant to section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930.

(1) For the purpose of this section—  
(1) The term "domestic article" means an article wholly or in part the growth or product of the United States; and the term "foreign article" means an article wholly or in part the growth or product of a foreign country.

(2) The term "United States" includes the several States and Territories and the District of Columbia.

(3) The term "foreign country" means any empire, country, dominion, colony, or protectorate, or any subdivision or subdivisions thereof (other than the United States and its possessions).

(4) The term "landed duty paid price" means the price of any foreign article after payment of the applicable customs or import duties and other necessary charges, as represented by the acquisition cost to an importing consumer, dealer, retailer, or manufacturer, or the offering price to a consumer, dealer, retailer, or manufacturer, if imported by an agent.

(j) The Authority is authorized to make all needful rules and regulations for carrying out its functions under the provisions of this section.

(k) The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to make such rules and regulations as he may deem necessary for the entry and declaration of foreign articles with respect to which a change in basis of value has been made under the provisions of subdivision (d) of this section, and for the form of invoice required at time of entry.

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill to encourage and assist the production of strategic and critical wool and mohair in the United States, and for other purposes."

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] would each vote "nay."

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Tennessee

[Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. LENNON], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are unavoidably detained on official business.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] are absent on official business.

I announce further that if present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] would each vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 7, nays 76, as follows:

## YEAS—7

Butler, Nebr.	Malone	Young
Dworshak	McCarthy	
Langer	Welker	

## NAYS—76

Aiken	Gore	Millikin
Anderson	Green	Monroney
Barrett	Hayden	Morse
Beall	Hendrickson	Mundt
Bennett	Hennings	Murray
Bowring	Hickenlooper	Neely
Bricker	Hill	Pastore
Bridges	Hoey	Payne
Burke	Holland	Potter
Bush	Humphrey	Purtell
Carlson	Ives	Robertson
Case	Jackson	Saltonstall
Clements	Jenner	Schoeppel
Cooper	Johnson, Colo.	Smathers
Cordon	Johnson, Tex.	Smith, Maine
Daniel	Johnston, S. C.	Smith, N. J.
Dirksen	Kerr	Sparkman
Douglas	Knowland	Stennis
Duff	Kuchel	Symington
Eastland	Long	Thye
Ellender	Magnuson	Upton
Ferguson	Mansfield	Watkins
Flanders	Martin	Wiley
Frear	Maybank	Williams
Fulbright	McCarran	
Gillette	McClellan	

## NOT VOTING—13

Butler, Md.	Goldwater	Lehman
Byrd	Hunt	Lennon
Capehart	Kefauver	Russell
Chavez	Kennedy	
George	Kilgore	

So Mr. MALONE'S amendment, in the nature of a substitute, was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated. It is offered in behalf of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], and myself.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUSH in the chair). The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from North Dakota for himself and other Senators.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, line 23, after the period, it is proposed to insert the following:

If the support price so determined does not exceed 90 percent of the parity price for shorn wool, the support price for shorn wool shall be at such level, not in excess of 90 percent nor less than 60 percent of the parity price therefor, as the Secretary determines necessary in order to encourage an annual production of approximately 360 million pounds of shorn wool.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, if I may have the attention of Senators, I think

I can explain my amendment in approximately 2 minutes.

Under the Aiken Act of 1948 and the Anderson Act of 1949, wool was supported at 90 percent of parity until the national production reached 360 million pounds. Under the pending bill it will be supported until it reaches 300 million pounds. After that, there would be no support whatever except that which applies to all commodities, of from nothing to 90 percent of parity. This amendment would reinstate the provisions of the Aiken and Anderson acts after a production of 300 million pounds had been reached and until production reaches 360 million pounds.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I should like to say that although I cannot accept this amendment for the committee, so far as I am personally concerned I have no objection to it. It is my understanding that it simply provides that at such time as price support at 90 percent of parity or above is no longer required to achieve the immediate objective of 300 million pounds of shorn wool, price support will continue at the same levels as those provided by the act of 1949.

I have no objection to the proposal of the Senator from North Dakota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a request for further time on the amendment, to speak in the negative or the affirmative? If not, the question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from North Dakota offered for himself and other Senators.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I call up my amendment designated "4-14-54-C," which was offered by me on behalf of myself and the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES]. Since it was presented, and as of the last hour, the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] asked that he might join as a cosponsor of the amendment. His statement was that his only regret is that the amendment is not for 90 percent rather than for 85 percent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota for himself and other Senators.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 8, line 10, it is proposed to insert the following:

Sec. 10. Section 201 of the Agricultural Act of 1949 (7 U. S. C., sec. 1446) is amended by inserting at the end of subsection (c) thereof the following:

"Notwithstanding any other provision of law, price supports to producers for milk, butterfat, and the products of milk and butterfat shall be provided at not less than 85 percent of parity for the marketing year ending March 31, 1955; and such price supports shall be provided for each marketing year thereafter at levels which in no event shall represent a reduction of more than 5 percent of parity under the support level for the preceding marketing year."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from Minnesota state the amount of time he yields to himself?

Mr. THYE. I yield myself 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the senior Senator from Minnesota for 15 minutes.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I have introduced the amendment because prior to April 1—in February, I believe it was—the Secretary of Agriculture announced

that he had been advised by the Solicitor of his Department that he could not possibly support the price of dairy products above 75 percent of parity for another year. He gave as his reason that the law was specific, and that the Solicitor had so interpreted it. Therefore, I have offered an amendment which proposes to give to the Secretary of Agriculture the right to support dairy products at 85 percent of parity, rather than at 75 percent, as has been announced for this year.

Mr. President, as we examine all the facts and records statistically, we cannot help but arrive at the conclusion that in this day, when the farmer is still faced with the operating expenses of the Korean war inflation, he cannot possibly continue operating at only 75 percent of parity, because among the young farmers today are the veterans of World War II and the Korean war.

They are young men who returned to their communities following the end of World War II and the Korean war and who bought not only high-priced machinery at Korean war inflation prices, but also dairy cows, for which they were compelled to pay anywhere from \$300 to more than \$400 apiece.

These young farmers have financial obligations. In the event that they must operate on an income of only 75 percent of parity, they will not survive. That means that we shall see these young men forced into financial bankruptcy.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THYE. I shall be delighted to yield, briefly, because the Senate is operating under a limitation of time.

Mr. CASE. I wish to ask but a single question. Does not the Senator from Minnesota feel that a limitation of 5 percent is the maximum by which any reduction might be made from the preceding year, which would be consistent with the principle that was expressed in the President's message to Congress on the agricultural program?

Mr. THYE. The Senator from South Dakota is correct in calling this to our attention, because it was in the message delivered by the President to the joint session of Congress that he said he would be opposed to a drastic reduction in the parity price support, either percentage-wise or dollarwise. I am not quoting the President verbatim, but that was my understanding of his statement.

The Senator from South Dakota is correct in stating that the amendment would permit a drop of only 5 percent in a given calendar year.

Mr. CASE. I think the Senator from Minnesota is doing a good service in bringing up the matter at this time.

Mr. THYE. In a statement which appears in a farm magazine, there is a quotation of Secretary Benson's statement on the NBC program "Youth Wants to Know." The question asked Mr. Benson was:

If I can make more money in the city than I can on the farm, what are the advantages of owning a farm?

The answer, by Ezra Taft Benson, Secretary of Agriculture, was:

There isn't any doubt that opportunities for many people for making money are

greater in the city. Last year, the average per capita income of farm people was \$882, as compared with \$1,898 for the rest of our population.

Mr. President, if those are the facts, as stated by the Secretary of Agriculture in a nationwide broadcast, then is there any justification for the Secretary of Agriculture to announce that the support price would drop to 75 percent of parity for one of the greatest segments of our agricultural economy? There is no phase of agriculture which is more adapted to the family type of farm operation than that of the dairy farm family unit. Dairy farming is not a soil-depleting type of farm operation; it is soil building. It is the type of farm operation which you and I, Mr. President, must protect in the United States, if we are to continue to have a balanced, family-type farm operation and to continue soil building at the same time.

If it is desired to examine the facts a little further, I have checked the records, and I hold in my hand the latest Twin City Milk Producers' Bulletin for April 1954. An examination of the March paying prices for 3.5 percent grade A base milk, delivered at the plant, discloses the following prices per hundred pounds:

Twin Cities, \$3.56; Lake Elmo, \$3.51; Elk River, \$3.46; Farmington, \$3.46; Watertown, \$3.46; Northfield, \$3.40; and River Falls, Wis., \$3.45.

Those are the prices which this great dairy organization paid its producers and producer members. There are more than 6,000 members producing milk in the vicinity of the Twin Cities and selling on the Minneapolis and St. Paul fluid-milk market.

In considering these prices it should be remembered that the farmer had to pay for the trucking of the milk into the Twin Cities consuming center.

When the producer has sustained a decrease of more than \$100 since the Korean war inflation, then I should say that he certainly cannot sustain another reduction of 50 cents or 60 cents a hundred pounds for his milk, and still continue to be a profitable operator and a good customer in the community in which he resides. If he is not a good customer in his community center it will be only a brief period of time before his town, village, or city will suffer a recession; and if a recession occurs in the communities in Minnesota I have named it will be only a matter of time until the industrial centers will have a recession, if not a depression.

Mr. President, these are the facts which have led me to stand on the floor of the Senate and oppose the very administration which I worked so hard to bring into office. I am not asking for any kind of handout for the American farmer. All I ask is that the farmer be given an opportunity to obtain a fair price for his commodity, while he works with his Government to reduce the overall production, as he has voted to do in the past year, and as he is doing today in connection with cotton planting and corn planting.

Mr. President, I say only that if we drop the support prices of our agricul-

tural commodities before we govern the surpluses there will be a recession throughout the country, for which it will be necessary to spend a great deal of money upon a public-works program, in order to overcome the recession. That is why I stand on the floor and debate this question.

From an examination of the records and statistics prepared by the Department of Agriculture, it will be found that the net income of farmers is not keeping pace with the national income. The percentage of the national income originating in agriculture was only 6 percent in 1953, the lowest percentage on record. It was 7.1 percent in 1952. The lowest previous figure was for 1932, when it was 7.3 percent.

Mr. President, when our percentage of agricultural income to national income is dropping to such figures as these, we had better start examining into the situation and determining how to arrest the constant decline which we have seen.

Farmers' receipts are dropping twice the rate that costs are coming down. In 1953 the realized gross farm income was 4 percent less than in 1952, but the total production expenses declined only 2 percent for the same period.

The operating costs of farmers are taking a larger proportion of the gross returns than ever before. In 1953 farmers retained as net income only 36.6 percent of their realized gross income, the smallest percentage for any year since 1932.

These are sobering facts; and when the percentages are translated into dollar figures, showing the tremendous drop in net farm income in recent years, due to inflationary costs of the things which the farmer must buy, the result is startling.

In 1947 the realized net income of farmers from farming was just under \$17 billion, which was 49 percent of the realized gross income of slightly over \$34 billion.

Last year the net income was \$12.8 billion, according to the latest figures of the Department of Agriculture. This was 36.6 percent of the gross income which was in excess of \$35 billion.

That means there was a drop of about \$4 billion in the annual net return of farmers in spite of the larger gross income, all due to the fact that the farmers' operating costs were \$5 billion higher last year than in a comparable 12-month period 7 years ago.

Latest figures announced by the Department of Agriculture on March 4 showed that this Nation's farmers earned 9 percent less money last year than the year before. At the same time, city dwellers' income increased in total by more than 6 percent.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THYE. Yes; I am delighted to yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. YOUNG. I think the Senator from Minnesota is making a very important point—one which we seem to overlook in debate today—and that is that agricultural income has declined drastically for as long as 5 years, and very severely in the past 2 years. Certainly the answer to the agricultural program,

which is tied in very closely with our overall economy, is not in lower price supports and to the extent of 15 percent at this time. I have some question as to the workability of the present price-support program for dairy products. I think a better program could be worked out. But certainly the answer is not in drastically lowering price supports. The Secretary of Agriculture has admitted that lowering price supports to 75 percent of parity will do little, if anything, to solve the surplus problem. Is that not correct?

Mr. THYE. The Senator from North Dakota is entirely correct. The surpluses which exist in dairy products do not constitute a serious situation. All of those surpluses could be disposed of in school lunches and increased allotments to welfare recipients. There are bills before the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry right now which propose perfecting the food-stamp plan, which would enable the Department of Agriculture to dispose of some of the dairy surpluses to those who need it.

Mr. YOUNG. I do not know of anyone in the Congress who knows more about the dairy industry than the senior Senator from Minnesota. It is high time that the Department of Agriculture put into operation some kind of program for disposing of dairy surpluses. After all these months in which the problem has existed there is still no program to any substantial degree, either a sales-promotion program or anything else that I know of, which would help in the dairy surplus situation.

Mr. THYE. The Senator from North Dakota is a man who truly understands farming as well as anyone possibly could. I realize that I have only 2 more minutes, but I shall allot myself an additional 2 minutes so that I may complete this one paragraph.

Here is another factor which has me alarmed, so far as the agricultural economic situation is concerned. I continue reading:

The net income of the farm population from all sources has been computed at \$20,466,000,000 for 1953, in comparison with \$22,458,000,000 for 1952. The income of the nonfarm, or urban population increased from \$243,468,000,000 in 1952 to \$259,099,000,000 in 1953.

The average per capita income of the non-farm population increased from \$1,842 to \$1,898 in 1953 as compared to 1952. In contrast, the average per capita income of farmers dropped from \$905 in 1952 to \$882 last year. There was actually a more marked drop of 6.5 percent in the amount of per capita income farmers actually derived from farming, the amount being \$655 for 1952 and \$615 for 1953.

The purchasing power per dollar of farm income remaining after production expenses declined in four of the last 5 years as prices paid by farmers for family living items rose nearly 15 percent. Purchasing power per dollar did not change much in 1953, but the decline in net dollar income reduced farmers' total purchasing power last year to a new postwar low approximately equal to its 1941 level. The farmers provide a great outlet for heavy industry such as farm machinery and trucks. I saw too many implement yards full of new machines last fall not to know what was happening to the farmers purchasing power.

## DANGER OF RECESSION

A further index to the agricultural situation today is provided by the figures on farm indebtedness. The farm mortgage debt in 1945, which was the lowest in the 40-year period from 1914 to the present, was \$4,760,000,000. It has risen every year since that time until today it stands at an estimated \$7,800,000,000.

I stop at that point and ask my colleagues to give thought to those figures. Back a few years ago the debt was \$4,760,000,000. Today it is \$7,800,000,000. I continue reading:

That is an increase of nearly 63 percent in the farm-mortgage debt in the past 8 years. Short-term debt has increased in the same period from slightly under \$2.9 billion at the end of 1945 to an estimated \$7.2 billion at the end of 1953.

The distinguished Senator who now occupies the chair [Mr. BUSH] is a banker, and he knows the financial situation better than I know it. The Senator knows that when there is an indebtedness trend both in real estate mortgages and short-time loans, which has increased in the amount I have cited, it is an alarm signal which we had better recognize. If supports are lowered while huge surpluses are hanging over our heads, the market prices are going to reflect the drop, and it will further aggravate the indebtedness of this Nation's agricultural group. For that reason the Senate must give consideration to the problem. This is the first opportunity the Senate has had to take a step in the right direction in the dairy products field. The right step is to amend the wool bill in such a manner as to enable the Government to arrest the difficulty the dairy producer is faced with these declining prices.

Mr. President, before closing, I ask unanimous consent that the rest of the prepared statement from which I have read may be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The farmer who grows the food is today getting less of the consumer's food dollar than at any time in the last 12 years. In fact, the farmer was actually receiving only about 45 cents of the consumer's food dollar in 1953. That is the lowest the farmer's share of the consumer's food dollar has been since World War II, and in fact the lowest since 1941, when it was 44 cents. The high point in this period was 53 cents in 1945. In other words, the costs of processing, distributing and selling are taking more of the consumer's food dollar, and the producer is getting less for the basic product.

Four million dairy farmers who derive all or part of their cash income from the sale of dairy products face serious economic hardship under the present situation. Further decline in purchasing power of dairy farmers in Minnesota, Iowa, Wisconsin, Indiana, Michigan, Ohio, New York, Pennsylvania, and the New England States, where dairying is a major source of farm income, could well be disastrous.

Last year when dairy-price supports were at 90 percent, milk producers actually received only 84 percent of parity. From 1952 to 1953 the average prices received by farmers for each 100 pounds of milk equivalent sold dropped from \$4.71 to \$4.08. It is estimated that if the proposed reduction in

the support price from 90 percent of parity to 75 percent of parity goes into effect, the support level would be dropped the equivalent of another 62 cents per hundredweight of milk. In that case dairy farmers might realize only \$3.56 per 100 pounds for all milk sold during the 1954-55 marketing year.

If in the coming marketing year, as in the past year, the support level should establish the selling price for dairy farmers, they will suffer an income loss of approximately \$600 million. In addition, there will be a decline in the value of their capital assets because of this drop in earning power. This might approach the capital asset loss they suffered in 1953 in the value of their cows, and heifers, 2 years old and over. This amounted to \$1,200,000,000 according to Department of Agriculture figures. If this loss should be only a fraction as great, say one-third, they would suffer a total loss in income and in reduction of capital assets of at least a billion dollars in 1954—an amount equaling 25 percent of their 1953 income.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, at this point in my remarks, a tabulation of telegrams which I received from persons both in Minnesota and other States of this country, relating not only to supports of 90 percent of parity on the six basic commodities, but in support of the dairy amendment. I have tabulated the names and towns appearing on those telegrams in order to save the cost of printing all the telegrams, and merely request that the tabulation be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the tabulation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Austin, Minn.: Robert Baudler, W. Kirchoerfer, Harold Murphy.

Bagley, Minn.: Jack Mathewson (president, Holst Copley Local Farmers' Union), Otto K. Olson (chairman, Clearwater County Farmers' Union).

Baudette, Minn.: Bennie Besser (secretary, Carp Farmers' Union Local), Melvin C. Olson. Bear River, Minn.: Matt A. Nelson (Itasca County farmers).

Beltrami, Minn.: Farmers' Union Oil Co., V. D. Hawkins, A. M. Larson.

Bemidji, Minn.: Ed Bohalmann, A. L. Brooks, Ivan Lauderberg, Leonard Mitberg. Benson, Minn.: Tom Amie, Lawrence E. Anderson, John E. Fahl, Walter F. Grotte, Chauncey E. Highes, O. H. Holton, Walter Svor.

Brandon, Minn.: Carl Hoglund. Cannon Falls, Minn.: Victor Blastwold, president; William Lundell, vice president; Arthur Haggstrom, secretary, Farmers' Union Local 488.

Clarkfield, Minn.: Jewell Haaland (chairman, Yellow Medicine County Farmers' Union), Orville Kompelieu (president, Normania Farmers' Union), Orley Miller, Wendell Miller.

Clinton, Minn.: Weinman Bros. Dent, Minn.: Edwin Albright (chairman, Dora Local), Dayton Jacobson.

Fergus Falls, Minn.: Ernest Bartels, Jr.; Arthur Stock; Elmer Stock.

Garfield, Minn.: Norman Garfield. Hancock, Minn.: Clifford Delp, Harry Hoffmann, Kenneth Zeltwanger.

Hinckley, Minn.: Frank Adams (president, Pine County Farmers' Union), Larry Sikkink (secretary, Hinckley Local Farmers' Union).

Holloway, Minn.: Harry Arnold, Ross Strawn (legislative officer, Farmers' Union Local 317, Swift County).

Kent, Minn.: Ira R. Bellmore. Lake Park, Minn.: Alvin O. Olson (president, Farmers' Union).

Long Prairie, Minn.: Martin Anderson, Ed Gresser, E. K. Colby, D. E. Frost, D. E. Hart,

George Hengemuhle, Martin Hengemuhle, Louis F. Masonick, Laurence Strack.

McIntosh, Minn.: Johnnie Oak. Madison, Minn.: Harry Peterson.

Mankato, Minn.: Albert Strobel, president; William Lan, secretary; Harold Lang, J. O. Corey, Harry Loeffler, directors, Blue Earth County Farmers' Union.

Montevideo, Minn.: Howard Anderson. Moose Lake, Minn.: Newell C. Anderson. Morris, Minn.: Hervey Richardson.

Newfolden, Minn.: Oscar Rokke (president, West Marshall County Farmers' Union).

Ormsby, Minn.: Rudolf Asendorf. Ortonville, Minn.: Russell Anderson.

Puposky, Minn.: Albert Belleveau, Eddie Winger.

Rothsay, Minn.: Raymond Dohrer, William Wigdahl.

St. James, Minn.: V. Bryan Bingham, Bert H. Gleseke, Richard Harbitz, John Hohman. Sauk Centre, Minn.: H. G. Severin.

Truman, Minn.: L. A. Becker, Orval R. Wendt.

Wanamingo, Minn.: Arnold Boraas (president, Goodhue County Farmers' Union), Arnold Sroyum (president, Wanamingo Local Farmers' Union).

Waseca, Minn.: Melvin Orley. Westbrook, Minn.: Norman O. Larson, Clifford Swenson.

Winthrop, Minn.: Elmer Tosch (chairman, Sibley County Chapter, Minnesota Farmers' Union).

Bagley, Minn.: Syvert Ramsrud. Blackduck, Minn.: Stanley Engberg (chairman, Local 103, Farmers' Union).

Blue Earth, Minn.: Mr. and Mrs. Melvin Thornton.

Cannon Falls, Minn.: R. R. Lundell, president; Vernon Prank, secretary, Cannon Falls Farmers' Union Local.

Clarkfield, Minn.: John Emblem (secretary, Yellow Medicine County Farmers' Union), Jewell Haaland (chairman, Yellow Medicine County Farmers' Union), Russell Quenemoen.

Greenbush, Minn.: Harold S. Johnson. New York Mills, Minn.: Verner Anderson (secretary, Cooperative Service, Inc.).

Windom, Minn.: Ernest Johnson.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 13 minutes of unused time remaining.

Mr. HUMPHREY addressed the Chair.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, if the Senator from New York [Mr. Ives] desires to speak on the amendment, since he is the cosponsor, I will yield to him whatever time he desires. If the Senator from New York does not desire to have that time, I shall be happy to yield in order that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] may ask me a question, if he so desires. The Senator from New York may have such time as he wishes of the remaining 13 minutes to speak on the amendment. He may have the remaining time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The remaining time is 12½ minutes.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I do not wish to speak at this time. I would rather yield and let the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] speak first.

Mr. HUMPHREY addressed the Chair.

Mr. THYE. Does the Senator from Vermont wish to ask me a question?

Mr. AIKEN. I do not.

Mr. THYE. I yield at the present time. The balance of my time will be used at a later time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield the floor?

Mr. THYE. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont controls the other time.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I yield 4 minutes to the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT]. Then I shall yield to the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON].

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Is it not true that a Senator may speak if he is recognized by the Chair, without any regard to the matter of the allotment of time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is advised that under the controlled-time agreement, the time is controlled by the two Senators named, and unless they yield the time, the time is not available to other Senators.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico will state it.

Mr. ANDERSON. I thought the Senator from Minnesota has risen to offer a substitute amendment. Is he not permitted to do so?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator may offer his amendment after the debate on the pending amendment is closed and the time for debate has expired.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I yield 4 minutes to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I should like to remind my colleagues in the Senate that the bill under consideration is intended to benefit the wool industry, and to express the hope that the bill, by having amendments added to it, will not be so transformed as to be a detriment to the industry which it is intended to benefit. The wool industry in the United States is not a surplus industry. It is not an industry which is in trouble because it is producing too much wool. It is a deficiency industry. It has been found necessary to provide some additional Government assistance in order to protect the industry from virtual extinction. So I hope in this debate it will not find itself in the role of the innocent bystander who is shot and killed in a battle between giants.

Therefore, Mr. President, I hope the Senate will reject all these amendments to the wool bill, first, for the protection of the wool industry itself.

At this point I should like to associate myself with the remarks made yesterday by my senior colleague, the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], who went in some detail into the actual problems of the wool industry. However, I should like to suggest to the Members of the Senate who today are submitting amendments to the bill that they will have an opportunity to debate the problem of surpluses when the administration's farm program reaches the floor of the Senate. That program is now in the hands of the committee. I hope we shall reserve our discussion of these problems until the committee concludes its hearings. Otherwise we shall invalidate the work of the committee and invalidate the work of the advisory committee set up by the Secretary of Agriculture, under whose

auspices and with whose assistance this general program has been developed over the past year.

Thus, Mr. President, I am sure the Members of the Senate will have ample opportunity to debate the question of surpluses; and I hope they will confine their consideration today to the question of a deficient industry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Utah has expired.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, both on this floor and elsewhere we have been discussing the dairy situation, for quite some time. I think it would be worth while for all Members of the Senate to read a pamphlet the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry had prepared in 1951, before the dairy situation got quite as acute as it is now. I called attention to the pamphlet yesterday, and I also call attention to it today, because it gives a review of our experience, and it is very informative. The heading is "Price Supports for Perishable Products—A Review of Experience."

Among the subjects reviewed is the milk and butterfat situation. When that experience was reviewed by the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry—not by the Department of Agriculture, in order to try to justify any policy it might have, but by the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry—we learned that the dairy price-support program was adopted late in 1949, and the schedule of price supports set up at that time was 79 percent of parity. I wish the Senate to bear that in mind, because now it is proposed to establish supports at 85 percent of parity. But what happened when supports were established at 79 percent of parity. The record is quite clear, for the report states:

At these price levels, substantial price-supporting purchases were required both in 1949 and 1950. The equivalent of approximately 3 percent of the total milk production was purchased in these 2 years. Dairy products are normally stored for only one season; yet after purchasing 114.3 million pounds of butter, 25.5 million pounds of cheese, and 325.5 million pounds of non-fat dry-milk solids in 1949, the Commodity Credit Corporation was able to sell back into domestic channels, during the winter of 1949 and 1950, only 9 million pounds of butter and 6 million pounds of cheese.

We found that at 79 percent of parity, the program could not possibly work. It was tried in 1949 and in 1950 and in 1951, and it could not possibly work. Why? Because it is so much easier not to distribute milk in small bottles from house to house, but to turn it into butter and cheese and nonfat dry-milk solids and pour them onto the market—for the trade to buy? No, Mr. President, for the Commodity Credit Corporation to buy; and that is exactly what happened under the program in those years.

What happened when the levels were set at 90 percent? We found exactly

the same thing occurring. We found millions and millions and millions of pounds of butter, cheese, and non-fat dry-milk solids becoming the property of the Commodity Credit Corporation, until everyone seemed to concede that that situation was becoming a scandal and a disgrace and was imperiling the entire support program; and then the Secretary of Agriculture reduce the supports to 75 percent.

We knew that the butter was not being put on the market, but that substitutes were, and that the butter producers were losing that market. Do we want that to continue?

Today the Senator from Minnesota said farm net income is not keeping pace with national income. However, we have had 90-percent supports all during the time when the farmers' net income has not been keeping pace with the national income. Today the Senator from Minnesota pointed out that the farmers' income was \$4 billion less in 1953 than it was in 1952. However, Mr. President, there were 90 percent supports during that time were there not? The Senator from Minnesota also has pointed out that farm debt has been becoming larger and larger, and that there was a 63-percent increase in farm debt in 8 years. In every one of those years there were 90-percent supports. Sometimes we realize that such procedures disturb the normal pattern of trade and leave the farmers in worse shape than they were in before.

In a study made in 1951 it was pointed out that these purchases cost \$286 million. It was said the Commodity Credit Corporation was going to recover \$130 million. How was that to be accomplished? It would be done because at the tail end of the period we got into some difficulties in Korea, and the Armed Forces moved into the dairy products market and bought great quantities of butter, cheese, and even nonfat dry milk solids.

It was pointed out that the key problem in connection with price supports is the disposal of stocks before they spoil, and that the sharp upturn in prices following the outbreak of the war in Korea made it possible to sell into domestic channels of trade the large stocks of dairy products which had been accumulated under the Commodity Credit Corporation's purchase program.

Mr. President, it was that experience which persuaded some to believe it might be better to restore the supports, and that is why they were restored at 90 percent of parity. However, it will be necessary to have another Korea every 6 months, 9 months, or 12 months in order to keep up with that record. We cannot put the support price at 90 percent, 80 percent, or 79 percent of parity and hope to keep tremendous stocks of butter, cheese, and dry milk from accumulating. If that is the best answer we have today, it is not a good answer; and the dairy industry and the dairy farmers should realize it.

Mr. President, several days ago the Secretary of Agriculture testified before the Senate Committee on Agriculture

and Forestry. In the course of his testimony he said:

This swelling total of Commodity Credit Corporation loans on inventories—limited, though it is, to a few commodities—is fast approaching a point where the entire program may collapse of its own weight.

Mr. President, is that what we are trying to accomplish? Are we trying to make sure that this agricultural program will collapse of its own weight? If so, the best way to proceed is to move back again into the dairy products support program that was causing so much trouble.

The Secretary of Agriculture made this significant comment, which I think we should remember:

I cannot believe that the continuation of a program which helped to create some of our most serious farm problems will ever solve them.

Mr. President, I think that comment applies to the present dairy products program. I do not understand how in the world we can believe that a continuation of a program that was causing all sorts of trouble to our milk situation can ever solve the problem.

I say we had better reject this amendment, and allow the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry to try to bring forth a program that seems to have more value to it than a program of having the Commodity Credit Corporation buy and store tremendous quantities of butter, cheese, and dry milk solids. We now have 400 million pounds of butter, about the same amount of cheese, and 600 million pounds of dry milk solids. What is the best suggestion thus far made about them? It is that we start making them into animal feed, as was done before. We have paid 17 cents a pound, on the average, for these stocks. We could not dispose of the stocks the Government had accumulated after paying an average of 8 or 9 cents a pound for them. If it had not been for the fact that those dairy products had to be shipped into certain parts of the world which had no other source of food, we would not have been able to sell any of them, even after we had paid only 8 or 9 cents a pound for them. Certainly, Mr. President, if we could not normally move those stocks at 8 or 9 cents a pound, we shall not be able to move the present stocks at 17 cents a pound.

Do Members of the Senate realize that only a short time ago we were in a discussion on this floor over the fact that the Treasury Department, which evaluated the Commodity Credit Corporation stocks, had written off several hundred million dollars? Why? Because it moved down the value of the dry skim milk solids from 17 cents a pound to 1 cent a pound.

What had they done with respect to butter? They had set the price of butter at only 37 cents a pound, but the Government was buying it at 66 cents a pound. The Army, when called upon to buy butter, was willing to pay only 15 cents a pound for it.

That is what we must do every time we get into this sort of program. I do not believe we want to go back into it. I think the experience we have had is sufficient. I believe that the fact that

we could accumulate 100 million pounds without adequate storage space for it ought to have been sufficient.

The dairy farmers were disturbed. The whole dairy industry was disturbed. The only people who were happy were those operating certain creameries, whose financial reports were examined. Certain creameries made more money than they had ever made before. Why? Because the program was not one under which the farmer was getting 90 percent of parity. The only people who were getting 90 percent of parity were those who were selling products to the Commodity Credit Corporation and the Treasury of the United States.

I say that we do not want added to the bill the amendment now pending, and I hope it will be defeated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from New Mexico has expired.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

I would be the last to say that there is no dairy problem in the United States. There definitely is, just as there is a problem in connection with wheat and probably in connection with other agricultural commodities. However, I do not believe that either of the amendments offered by the Senators from Minnesota would provide a solution to the problem.

The net effect of the amendment proposed by the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] would be to restore two-thirds of the drop in the retail price of butter and cheese which has taken place since the 1st of April. There is no assurance in this amendment that in restoring higher prices on butter and cheese to the consumer, the extra price would be reflected back to the farmer, because there is no provision of law which so far has enabled the executive branch of the Government to bring about such a happy situation. By "happy situation" I mean that when Congress guarantees the farmer a certain price for his commodities, he ought to get it. It should not be diverted to handlers between the Department of Agriculture and the farmer himself, as it is today.

I do not intend to speak particularly on the dairy problem at this time, because beginning tomorrow the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry will conduct executive meetings in an effort to arrive at a solution of the problems with which some of our farmers find themselves faced today. I regard the most serious problems as those affecting wheat and milk and dairy products.

Some time ago the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], and I introduced a bill which I think has a great deal of merit. The provisions of that bill will be submitted to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry for its consideration as soon as we get together in executive session.

The bill which we introduced would tie the support price for milk to the support price for feed grain. It would not tie it to tobacco, cotton, and peanuts, as the amendment offered by the junior

Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] would do.

Mr. President, I yield myself 3 more minutes, to make sure that I have enough time.

The bill which we introduced provides that the Secretary may have discretion to fix the support price of milk and dairy products between 75 and 90 percent of parity. He would not be strictly bound to the lower level, as he was on April 1 of this year under the present law.

Our proposal provides that the Secretary may support the price of milk and butterfat through the purchase of fluid milk as well as any dairy product, rather than simply through the purchase of butter, cheese, or powder.

Our proposal also provides that the Secretary may require some assurances from manufacturers or processors that they are passing on the legitimate support price to the farmers, in return for receiving whatever level of support may be offered on the manufactured products by the Commodity Credit Corporation.

The bill also provides that the Secretary may make surplus milk and dairy products available to low-income families at reduced rates, if he found it desirable to do so.

The last provision of the bill would give the Secretary some authority to control the marketing of milk, so that one market would not be flooded and another perhaps run short, thus preventing the market from breaking down because of improper marketing.

These are some of the provisions which our committee will consider in working out legislation affecting the dairy industry.

I do not believe that either of the amendments relating to milk and dairy products, which are offered as amendments to the wool bill, belongs in the wool bill. Further, I do not believe they would solve the problem, but would more likely compound the difficulty in which we now find ourselves. Certainly any solution of the problems of the dairyman today should not involve a sharp increase in the price of butter and cheese to the consumer, because I do not believe our consumers are in any mood at this time to accept such a situation.

Mr. President, are there any speakers against the amendment offered by the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE]?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont has 10 minutes remaining. The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] has 12 minutes.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, does the Senator from New York desire any time?

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I should like to have about 5 minutes.

Mr. THYE. The Senator from New York may have whatever time he desires.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, my name appears on this amendment, principally as a matter of protest. I do not like the way in which the support price on dairy products was reduced to 75 percent of parity. I grant that what the distinguished Senator from Vermont has to say is true. I think the bill which he and the distinguished Senator from New Mexico and I have introduced is the better way of approach. Nevertheless, I

intend to support this amendment. It offers a gradual reduction, rather than a complete reduction, to the 75-percent level.

In so doing, however, I wish to point out one or two things to our colleagues who come from the food-producing States. I come from a food-producing State, too. In fruits, vegetables, and dairy products, it will be found that New York ranks among the highest producers in the Union. I believe we are second only to Wisconsin in the production of milk.

I point out also that I come from a State with large urban populations—far greater than those in any other State in the Union. I insist that the time has come to do something about the flexible approach. The consumers are getting wise to what is going on, and sooner or later we in the Congress who come from areas where we desire to have our food producers reasonably protected will find ourselves in a condition in which, at least in the House of Representatives, where populations are primarily represented, we shall be outvoted.

New York State agriculture stands for the flexible approach, in no uncertain terms. Our farmers are perfectly willing to go as low as 75 percent of parity, assuming that everyone else does. But why the dairy industry, of all industries, should be singled out for unequal treatment is something which many of us cannot understand. That is why I am supporting the pending amendment.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I yield 4 minutes to the junior Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN].

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I am glad to have the opportunity of speaking in behalf of the amendment. I represent a State which is deeply interested in the welfare of the dairy industry. At least half of our agricultural income comes from dairy products. The return to the farmers, even prior to the time the support was reduced from 90 percent to 75 percent was a very meager one. I have in my hand a study made by the department of agricultural economics of the Cornell University Agricultural Experiment Station which shows the very small return that has gone to the men who conduct the dairy farms in our State, even to those who are most efficient.

The support price has now been reduced from 90 percent to 75 percent of parity. That means that the dairy farmers of New York State and of other States—States like Minnesota, Wisconsin, and many other States—have definitely been confronted with diminishing revenues for their products. At the same time they are compelled to pay the same high prices for their feedstuffs and for all the other supplies they must obtain that they had to pay previously.

As I pointed out this morning, it means that the dairy farmers of New York State and of other States find themselves in a squeeze caused on the one hand by the reduction in revenues due to a lowering of price supports and on the other by a continuation of the high prices which they must pay for supplies of all kinds.

I do not seek anything for the dairy farmers of New York State that I do not seek also for other farmers—they must all be on the same basis—but there is no reason why certain groups of agricultural producers should be penalized.

I feel strongly that the dairy farmers, the men who produce milk and the other products derived from milk—cheese, powdered milk, butter, and similar products necessary for healthful living—should not be placed at a disadvantage in respect to support prices generally.

I therefore hope very much that the pending amendment or the substitute amendment to be offered by the distinguished junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] will be adopted, so that the dairy farmers will be relieved of the pressure of a squeeze, from which they cannot possibly escape under the present conditions of the lower returns for their products, and the high prices they must pay for feedstuffs and other supplies which they must buy in order to conduct their business and to maintain steady production.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] has 4 minutes remaining, and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] has 10 minutes remaining.

#### VISIT TO THE SENATE OF THE HONORABLE ALISTER McMULLIN, PRESIDENT OF THE AUSTRALIAN SENATE

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, the Vice President has with him a distinguished guest, the Honorable Alister McMullin, President of the Australian Senate. I am glad to yield the remainder of my time to any Member of the Senate who desires, as I do, to meet Senator McMullin.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair extends the welcome of the United States Senate to its distinguished visitor from Australia.

Mr. AIKEN. I yield the remainder of my time so that the Senate may take a recess for the purpose of meeting the distinguished visitor from Australia.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I call up my amendment—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's amendment is not in order at this point. The time is under the control of the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. I merely wish to yield the time for a recess so that Members of the Senate may meet the distinguished visitor from Australia.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I certainly wish to concur in that request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request that the Senate take a recess for the purpose stated by the Senator from Vermont, who yields the remainder of his time for that purpose? The Chair hears no objection, and it is so ordered.

Thereupon (at 3 o'clock and 36 minutes p. m.), the Senate took a recess until 3:44 p. m.

During the recess, the Honorable Alister McMullin, President of the Australian Senate, was greeted by Members

of the Senate, who were presented by the Vice President.

On the expiration of the recess, the Senate reassembled, and was called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. BUSH in the chair).

#### DEVELOPMENT OF THE DOMESTIC WOOL INDUSTRY

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2911) to provide for the development of a sound and profitable domestic wool industry under our national policy of expanding world trade, to encourage increased domestic production of wool for our national security, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair advises the Senate that the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] said that he would be glad to have the junior Senator from Minnesota offer an amendment at this point.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from Minnesota.

I now call up my amendment 3-9-54-A, offered on behalf of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] and myself, as a substitute for the amendment of the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the junior Senator from Minnesota.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 8, line 10, it is proposed to insert the following:

Sec. 10. Section 201 of the Agricultural Act of 1949 (7 U. S. C., sec. 1446) is amended by inserting at the end of subsection (c) thereof the following:

"The price-support level for milk, butterfat, and the products of milk and butterfat for any year shall not be reduced by more than 5 percent of the actual price intended to be reflected to farmers by the support program for the preceding marketing year, except that such limitation does not apply to reductions due exclusively to changes in the parity index.

"Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the parity percentage level at which price supports for milk and butterfat and the products of milk and butterfat are provided shall not be less than the parity percentage level at which rigid mandatory price supports are provided for the basic commodities."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from Minnesota state the amount of time he wishes to take to discuss his amendment?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from Nevada to state a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. McCARRAN. Does the Senator from Minnesota offer his amendment as a substitute for the amendment of his colleague?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, that is correct.

As a brief explanation of the purpose of the amendment, I should like to say that it merely assures equality of treatment to America's great dairy industry.

As the Senate knows, the amendment is cosponsored by the distinguished senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY]. The amendment links the level of support prices for dairy products to the level of support prices for basic commodities.

I wish to emphasize that, Mr. President, in view of the action which was taken by the Senate in the vote on the Ellender amendment. The amendment which is being offered by the Senator from Wisconsin and myself links the level of the support prices for dairy products to the level of support prices for basic commodities.

In the future, Mr. President, this may have very, very important application. In other words, if the Congress should adopt a price-support program which would provide for a price-support level below 90 percent of parity, then the dairy price-support level could be kept even with or kept at a balance with the feed-grain prices or the basic commodity prices.

In this respect it embodies the principle approved by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], as well as by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], former Secretary of Agriculture, in their own bill which is now before the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. I wish my colleagues to know that what this amendment basically does is to give equity of treatment in price supports to dairy products with the price-support levels for the feed grains and, particularly, the basic commodities.

It further provides that if support levels are to be lowered they shall not be dropped lower than 5 percent in any year. This is in accord with the President's own promise that any adjustment should be gradual rather than abrupt.

A bill containing the same language has been cosponsored by at least 25 Members of this body from both sides of the aisle, indicating its overwhelming support. In other words, the amendment is in the form of a bill which is now before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, cosponsored by over 25 Members of the Senate.

During the course of my persistent but, unfortunately, temporarily losing fight to prevent Secretary Benson's drastic cut of dairy supports to 75 percent of parity from going into effect on April 1, I believe I have made it amply clear that the dairy industry of America rightly feels that it is being discriminated against.

From statements of Agricultural Committee Members in both this body and in the other House, it should be apparent to all that the Congress is not going to let that full cut stand. It is regrettable that the Secretary of Agriculture insisted on so upsetting the dairy markets by putting into effect a price level that must be raised.

Let me make it crystal clear that there are pronouncements from both the House of Representatives and the Senate that the price-support level of 75 percent of parity is not going to stand. I again point out that leading spokesmen have stated that by the end of June we shall lift the supports from

the low of 75 percent of parity to a higher level.

Mr. President, let me answer the argument as to whether we should attach to the wool bill such an amendment as the one I am proposing. It is obvious—and if it is not obvious, I wish some responsible Member of this body would say so—that the price-support level for dairy products is going to be raised before the adjournment of this session of the Congress.

If it is going to be raised before Congress recesses or adjourns, the best time for it is now, because every month the price-support level is down, the farmers continue to lose money, and the normal, orderly marketing of dairy products in this country will continue to be disrupted.

Congress has determined that support of dairy prices should be mandatory, yet it has left the level of that support to the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture. Under existing legislation that is the situation.

I point out, Mr. President, that the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Benson himself, in his recommendations to the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, has continued to recommend that same legislation. I point out that President Eisenhower, in his message on agriculture, and the necessity for new agricultural legislation, recommended no change in legislation for price supports for dairy products, approving what we now have in the law.

What is being proposed in this amendment, however, is to relate the price-support level for dairy products with the price-support level for basic commodities. I say this is much more equitable and a much more sensible proposal.

I desire to raise one other point.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at this point, before he goes to another subject?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. I may say to the Senator from Minnesota that I appreciate very much the problem he is trying to cope with, and certainly I am interested in it. But the second part of his amendment, which ties price supports for milk and butterfats and milk and butterfat products to rigid price supports for storable commodities, it seems to be, creates a burden that hardly can be carried without the control of the production of dairy products.

What would be the Senator's answer to the point I make with reference to the broadness of his amendment and pegging at rigid price supports, mandatory price supports, at the same level, as I understand his amendment does, the basic, storable, controllable commodities?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from Mississippi for his question.

First, the amendment provides that there can be a maximum of a 5-percent drop in any 1 year.

Mr. STENNIS. That is a very good provision.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Second, it ties in the dairy price-support level with the basic commodities. The Senator from Mississippi has raised a question which

is surely a legitimate and a very important one, namely, that since there are acreage control mechanisms and sometimes production quotas for storable commodities, what is there to guarantee or to protect the public and the Government from excess production of dairy commodities?

I may say that there is no mechanism provided in terms of production quotas. I recall that when the Brannan plan was suggested in the Senate, or in Congress, almost everyone had something good to say about production payments with respect to the method of support, but they did not like production controls.

What have we under the proposal which the junior Senator from Minnesota is advocating? In the long run of time, the dairy industry of the United States has not overproduced. Secondly, the dairy industry of this country is now engaged in a tremendous advertising campaign to step up the consumption of dairy products. The American Dairy Association—the ADA—has set an extensive program of advertising for the better use of its commodities.

I think the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], since he is a very fair-minded man, would be interested in hearing what Secretary Benson had to say about the surpluses. I quote from the Secretary's statement at the time he announced the new low of 75-percent price supports. This is what Secretary Benson said on February 16, speaking about the supply situation a year earlier:

Commodity Credit Corporation stocks of dairy products were relatively low. \* \* \* Production of milk and butterfat had been about equal to demand during the previous 4 years when prices of milk and butterfat had been supported.

That is the first point. Secretary Benson said that up until this year the production of milk and butterfat had been about equal to the demand for the previous 4 years. What else did he say? He said:

Among the factors that affected production during the past year were a repetition of mild winter weather which brought abundant pastures and increased off-season dairy production. In addition, drought forced beef cattle sales and a drop in prices which resulted in the holding in northern areas of cows which otherwise would have been culled from dairy herds.

In other words, what Mr. Benson said was that the present overproduction in the dairy industry has been caused by unusual weather conditions and falling cattle prices, which discourage the sale of cull cows.

If the dairy price support is at 90 percent, and the support price of feed grains is at 75 percent, the tendency would be, of course, to invest more and more capital in dairy farming so as to get the advantage of the higher price; but when the grain price supports and dairy price supports are in relative balance, there is a more balanced production and a more balanced use of capital in the development of agricultural pursuits. That is my reply to the Senator. There is no way I can think of in which anyone can regulate positively the production of dairy products.

Let me say, in reference to the so-called surpluses of dairy products, that while the surpluses have been trumpeted and heralded as being a great problem to the people of the United States they can be turned into a blessing with imagination, with plans, and with a creative attitude. Program after program is before the committees of Congress to utilize our abundance. There is the stamp plan program. As my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Minnesota, said a while ago, if the fluid milk program for our schools were what it ought to be, the consumption of fluid milk would be increased in unbelievable proportions, and would utilize much of the surplus which seems to be bothering us at present.

I might point out one other factor. The amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin and myself provides as follows:

The price-support level for milk, butterfat, and the products of milk and butterfat for any year shall not be reduced by more than 5 percent of the actual price intended to be reflected to farmers by the support program for the preceding marketing year.

In other words, this amendment meets the criticism which has been heard on the floor of the Senate, namely, that the processors and the manufacturers of milk products and butterfat products receive the biggest benefit from price supports. The Humphrey-Wiley amendment provides that the price-support program shall not be less than 5 percent of the actual price intended to be reflected to the farmers by the support program for the preceding marketing year. So in the amendment we have taken care of several complaints.

First, we have disposed of the complaint that the dairy price-support program may be higher than the price-support program for feed grains. We have tied them together, so that they are in balance.

Second, we have provided some flexibility. We have said that the price support may drop as much as 5 percent in any one marketing year.

Third, we have met the criticism which has been leveled again and again against the dairy price-support program, namely, that most of its benefits go to the processors and the handlers, by writing into the amendment that the support price is to reflect the price intended for the farmer in the price-support measure, so that the producer of the milk will get the benefit of this particular price-support effort.

I wish to make the point to my colleagues in the Senate that once the process is started of lowering price supports on commodities such as dairy products, it will soon move to other commodities. I remind the Senate that already the talk is that since price supports on dairy products are down to 75 percent, perhaps the price support on feed grains ought to go to 75 percent. What that amounts to is putting in jeopardy not only the dairy farmer, but also the producer of the feed grains. It amounts to a lowering of prices without regard to the fixed costs which the farmer has. Our farmers today have

fixed costs for feed, equipment, taxes, electricity, telephones, the operating expenses of machinery, and other items, which are not being lowered by any kind of price-support program. Those costs are fixed. Instead of going down, they have been going up. It is impossible to maintain a solvent agricultural economy with high-fixed costs and a lowering of the income to the farm producer.

Mr. President, in order to complete my statement, I yield myself an additional 3 minutes.

I call the attention of the Senate to what we can do in terms of a long-range program for the use of our abundance. No greater mistake could be made in Congress than to fool around with dairy-price supports, by lowering them to a point where the dairy herds are endangered. It takes a long time to build a good dairy herd. It is not like raising hogs. One literally can get himself into and out of the hog-raising business in a year. But it requires a great investment to have a fine dairy farm. Even the small dairy producer, with 15 or 16 cows, has thousands of dollars tied up in modern equipment, in substantial barns, in high-priced feeds, and in many expensive pieces of equipment which are necessary to meet the modern health regulations. So I point out that if the Congress of the United States wants to design a policy which will drive literally hundreds and hundreds of our small producers out of the dairy business, the way it can do it is to permit the price-support program to remain at 75 percent of parity, or, in reality, at much lower supports.

If the Congress of the United States would like to take a look at the long pull rather than the short term, it can maintain a price-support program which is tied in with the overall price of feed grains, under legislative policy. That is exactly what this amendment is intended to do, and it will do so without furthering the surpluses. It will do so if the Congress has the will to try to solve the problem by disposing of the surpluses.

Mr. President, I should like to yield whatever time may be required by my associate in the amendment, the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY].

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I had not intended to speak, because my dear friend, the Senator from Minnesota, has so well stated the import of the amendment. Yet, in view of his graciousness, I do wish to say something which I think is significant not only to the farmer but to the economy of this country. Time and time again I have had the experience of hearing businessmen and others mention the big profits which dairy farmers are making. They little realize that if it were not for the profits which the farmers were making, and they are not big, there would not be this good, healthy condition we have had in the past among merchants, bankers, automobile salesmen, and other businessmen.

It has been stated that in my State if, by virtue of the condition which now exists, the price of milk goes on the skids to 60 cents a hundredweight, it

will mean a drop in the purchasing power of the farmers of Wisconsin, because we produce approximately 16 billion pounds of milk, of \$80 million.

It is a matter of history that practically every depression has started at the farm level. Why? Mr. President, the answer is simple. If the farmers of my State lose \$80 million in purchasing power—and already prices have gone down and down—it means that in the cities of Kenosha and Racine, in my State, and in cities like Minneapolis and St. Paul, Minn., where tractors and farm machinery are produced, there will be, and there already are, thousands unemployed. The last information I had was that in Kenosha there were something like 6,000 unemployed. In Milwaukee there are thousands of unemployed persons who previously were engaged in manufacturing and producing the machinery which the farmer needs to maintain the level of production he has maintained in the past.

Mr. President, when I was a young man, attending a university, I learned a little bit in the field of economics by listening to folks who were interested not only in the theory of economics, but in the common, everyday practices of living. I do not know of a better illustration to show what I am driving at than the following: In 1945 the then President of the United States and the great labor leaders of this country were advised by their economist advisers that we were about to enter upon the greatest depression the world had ever seen. They based that finding upon what happened after the First World War, when we settled down and forgot that what was needed was purchasing power. What happened this time? The predicted depression did not come, because the great vision and heart of America sensed that there was a great need to rejuvenate our allies, and we spent up to \$7 billion a year for that purpose. That \$7 billion did not go to Europe. Let us give them credit; they came to us and made demands.

Mr. President, the point I am trying to make is that when I was attending the university someone said that at one given time putting an extra dollar in the economic stream is equivalent to putting in \$20 at another given time. I do not remember whether that other given time was 6 months or a year after the war. However, the \$7 billion we appropriated created credit. The credit created demand. That demand was upon the production plant of America. The production plant of America created thereby resulted in more workers of America being employed. Those workers received wages to spend, and the farmers sold their products to them and in turn received money. The result was that we had a rather feverish condition which we call inflation. The depression did not come.

But now, Mr. President, we are faced with another situation. We do not hesitate to say that the wage earner is entitled to a minimum wage. We fix his minimum wage. However, we say to the farmer, who cannot fix the price on his own commodity, "We are just going to

let you go." He is the same farmer who, during the war years and afterwards, when the world needed his products, literally fed the whole Western World.

So, Mr. President, I go back to this one-dollar proposition. In my State, if purchasing power goes down, and the people of my State have started to lose \$80 million in purchasing power, and if that is multiplied by 20, there exists something of an economic impact which is going to be felt not only in Wisconsin but throughout the whole country. Already the farmers will not buy, because they do not have the money with which to buy.

Mr. President, the reason I go into these details is to indicate as clearly as I can that it is not a question simply of wanting to help the farmer. We want to maintain the economic health of this country. We want to recognize that the wealth which comes out of the soil, through the labor and sweat of these men, women, and children, is basic wealth; and in view of the fact that, under our economic system, they cannot fix prices as other persons do, it is a special problem. Even the professional man can say, "My fee is so and so." The merchant says, "This suit is going to cost you so much." But the farmer hauls his milk to market, and someone says, "This is the price you will receive."

That is why I have joined in the amendment with the distinguished Senator from Minnesota. I feel the problem is in the interest of the economic health not only of my State, which is the greatest milk-producing State in the Union, but is directly in the interest of the economic health of every small-business man in my State and of every individual in this whole country.

In other words, to use another analogy, when a disease strikes in a community, we do something about it. Now we have recognized that when economic paralysis begins, it is our function to do something about it, especially when it relates to the group of Americans who are really sane, middle-of-the-road thinkers; namely, the farmers.

However, it is not proposed that this action be taken simply for them. Let us be sensible and factual and state frankly that we take this action because it is in the interest of the general welfare, not simply in the interest of the farmers alone. When a farmer gets a dollar, he puts it back into the market, and there creates demand, which creates additional demand on the production plants, which then must have additional labor, and the additional workers are paid, and that results in the creation of additional demand for commodities. Thus we have economic health.

So, Mr. President, I am very happy to join with the distinguished junior Senator from Minnesota in urging the adoption of his amendment to the amendment of the senior Senator from Minnesota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I am sure the Senator from Vermont and perhaps other Senators on his side will

wish to comment on the amendment. Therefore, I invite the Senator from Vermont to use or to apportion some of the time available to him.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont has 30 minutes at his disposal.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I have not received any requests for time in which to speak on the amendment the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] has offered as a substitute for the amendment of the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE].

Personally, I cannot see the logic of tying price supports for dairy products to the prices received by the producers of tobacco, cotton, and peanuts. I can see the logic of tying price supports for dairy products to the prices received for feed grains. That proposal is now being considered by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

It is true that approximately 7 percent of the cost of producing milk in the northeastern States is due to the price of corn. Corn is the only basic commodity that is used directly by the dairy farmers in connection with the production of milk. So I can see the logic of tying the support price of dairy products to the price of corn, rather than to the prices of other basic commodities.

Therefore I believe it is logical to tie the support of dairy products to the prices of feed grains. On the other hand, I cannot see any logic in attempting to tie the supports of dairy products to the prices of tobacco, cotton, and peanuts.

Mr. President, at this time I yield 7 minutes to the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON].

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I wish to take up the thought right where the Senator from Vermont left off, and also to discuss the question asked by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], when he pointed out that there are controls on various commodities, and that it is one thing to have mandatory 90-percent supports on agricultural commodities that are controllable, and it is quite something else to put them on agricultural commodities that never have been controlled and cannot be controlled.

Time after time on this floor I have said that the finest example to be cited among agricultural commodities is tobacco. Tobacco has been supported at 90 percent. That program may cost a few dollars or it may cost practically nothing, because the tobacco producers have extremely accurate controls, and they measure down to nine-tenths or seven-tenths of an acre, and make absolutely certain that the supply will be in line with the demand.

I have said repeatedly that cotton control is well arranged and handled, and I would be willing to see it continued over a very long period, for I know that cotton will be placed under adequate controls and adequate limitations. So I would be willing to see that program continued for a long time, even though there were a sizable carryover. For instance, we now have a carryover of nearly 10 million bales, whereas 3 million or

4 million bales would be sufficient for housekeeping purposes. However, that cotton can be stored for 20 years, and at the end of that time it will still be good. We know that is so, because it has been demonstrated.

But when it is said that the requirement for 90 percent supports for dairy products will be tied to the requirement for rigid mandatory supports for the basic commodities, and when it is said it is necessary to have 90 percent supports for dairy products, even though the program has not worked well, and that it is necessary to tie the program for dairy products with programs that have worked well, I reply by saying that I do not believe the cotton producer or the tobacco producer or the peanut producer or the rice producer will like it.

Perhaps we shall have a little trouble with rice next year; but we know we can bring rice under proper control again. Occasionally we have trouble with wheat; at times it gets away out of line, but we know we can establish some sort of control over it. The greatest advantage in the case of wheat is that it can be shipped all over the world to people who can use it. We do not have quite as much success with the program for corn, because the great bulk is consumed on the farms where it is produced; and it is rather hard to predict what will be done by the farmers in connection with their production of corn, under the acreage allotments for corn.

But, Mr. President, certainly we do not wish to tie the requirement for 90 percent supports for commodities which cannot be controlled, or which it has never been possible to control well, with the supports for basic commodities, every time there is provided 90 percent support for the basic commodities.

Mr. President, reference has been made to the testimony of the Secretary of Agriculture on April 21, only a few days ago, that the stocks of butter, cheese, and dried milk now in the Government's hands are huge. I wish to call especial attention to the following sentence from his testimony before the committee:

During the marketing year which ended March 31, the equivalent of 10 percent of the Nation's total milk production—some 12 billion pounds—found its way into Commodity Credit Corporation ownership.

That was at the 90 percent support level.

Mr. President, earlier today I read from a report of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry in 1951, when it was pointed out that with a 79 percent level of price supports, only 3 percent of the product found its way into Commodity Credit Corporation ownership. When we move from 79 percent to 90 percent, we get 10 percent of the product coming into the hands of the Government. That makes an unbearable load.

Mr. President, we have not always had such a provision for supports for these products. We put them on in 1949. So long as there is provision for support at 75 to 90 percent, with full discretion on the part of the Secretary of Agriculture, the program might work out fairly well.

When the Secretary of Agriculture announced he would take off 90-percent supports, he made a speech to which I referred yesterday. The speech was made at Chicago, and there he warned the American Dairy Association that it had better put its house in order. He pointed out that in 1952 only 695 pounds of milk had been used per person, the lowest on record.

Mr. President, why do you suppose that in 1952 the per capita consumption of milk in the United States was the lowest on record? It was because the producers and dealers had lost their interest in trying to sell milk to the individual consumers. Instead, they were trying to sell the milk equivalent in dairy products to the Treasury, trying to move the milk into the storehouses of the Commodity Credit Corporation. After all, it is so much easier to skim off the cream and turn it into butter and cheese and turn the remainder into dry-milk solids. The farmer was not benefiting from that program. The testimony is quite clear that the farmer was receiving far less under 90-percent supports; but there were those who said, "This is a wonderful program. We do not have to worry any more about whether our truckdrivers will go on strike. We just turn the milk into cheese, butter, and dry, skim milk solids, and put it under Commodity Credit Corporation loans."

Mr. President, I thought we had enough of that program; and I thought we recognized that when the Secretary of Agriculture cut down the program it would be kept cut down.

The Senator from Mississippi pointed out that it is hard on the producers who have to operate under programs with controls. Controls are unpopular; people are not anxious to have their production of cotton cut down; they are not anxious to have limitations imposed on their production of peanuts or of rice. They accept them because they recognize that the program has to be handled in that way. But when there is a commodity that it is impossible to control, or a commodity which we have had great difficulty in controlling, and on which production has been rising year after year, I think 90-percent rigid support prices cannot be put on and kept there indefinitely.

I know that the pending amendment is designed to help the dairy farmer. I know that it is sponsored, as was the amendment offered by the senior Senator from Minnesota, by two Senators who are as interested as they can be. I certainly include the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] in that statement. The two Senators are trying their very best to help the industry, and I know that those in that industry believe they need some additional assistance. But I say that such assistance will come when the milk distributors of the country start the fight to get back the 130 pounds per capita market which they have lost in the past 12 years. They have lost it because they have not been merchandising. They have not been trying as hard as they could. Now it comes back on the farmer in the form of a reduction in price. If we do not

take this program the distributors of the country, once they have bought the milk from the farmers, may start putting the milk where it belongs in the form of fluid milk for the children and others in the country.

The speech by the Secretary pointed out that if the farmers in the dairy industry would try to recapture the market of 130 pounds of milk per person which has been lost in the past 12 or 13 years they would turn the milk surplus into scarcity. That statement is absolutely true.

The way to recapture that market is not to continue to store the product up in the stocks of the Commodity Credit Corporation, but to sell it to the public. That is what must be done with it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from New Mexico has expired.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, how much time have I?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota has 3 minutes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I have lived to see the day when the philosophy of divide and conquer has been applied to agriculture, and has been made quite effective in the Senate. If we start to play one commodity off against another in the Senate, the farm program will be finished. If we start to play off cotton against dairy products, and corn against wheat and certain other cereal grains, the farm program will be finished. We must either hang together or we shall assuredly hang separately. I am rather amazed to see how effective has been the process of dividing the producer from the consumer, and dividing one commodity from another.

I ask Senators if we are to say to the public that the dairy farmer is to get only 75 percent of parity. Is that what the Senator from New Mexico means when he says that when there were 79 percent price supports only 3 percent of the product went into the Commodity Credit Corporation stocks? Why did he not say that in 1951 we did not have as much production as we had in 1953? Why did he not say that in 1951 we had one of the severest winters in history, and that in 1953 we had one of the mildest winters in our history?

Why did he not say that in 1951 beef prices were at an almost all-time high, whereas in 1953 they were at an almost all-time low—at least so far as the previous 10 years was concerned.

Of course, the reason for much of the surplus milk production is that beef prices were so low that farmers did not cull their herds. A part of the reason for surplus production is that for two winters we have had unseasonably good weather for pastures.

The Secretary of Agriculture has made it crystal clear that there is no genuine surplus of dairy products. I say that if we cripple the dairy industry by cutting down the price support level so that the producer cannot produce at a reasonable profit, or must produce at a loss, we shall denude American farms of their dairy cattle.

Then what shall we do? The consumer will pay more. The country will be in trouble because of a shortage of

dairy products. Today we might use some imagination and absorb the surplus stocks of dairy products.

There is no evidence whatsoever that there has been any waste of butter, milk, or cheese. These products are in good condition, and with a little imagination they can be used.

Finally, let me repeat once and for all a warning to my colleagues. Never start playing off cotton against dairy products. Do not start playing off low-priced dairy products against high-priced feed grains. If we start that, we open Pandora's box. Let me make it crystal clear that we are in for trouble if such a process ever starts.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I think the example offered by the Senator from Minnesota is not at all applicable in this case. In his proposal to give support for dairy products at the same level as support for wheat, he apparently forgets that wheat is under very strong production controls. I do not want to see the time when we must tell the dairy farmer that he is compelled to get rid of 15 or 20 percent of his livestock. I do not believe that is necessary. I think it is possible to arrive at a better solution than that.

I believe that if we should fix a rigid level of 90-percent price supports for dairy products we would find millions of acres of land taken out of corn, wheat, and cotton production devoted to the production of dairy products. Then it follows that we would have to exercise controls just as strong with respect to the marketing of dairy products as we do with respect to wheat and cotton today. So I do not think the example which he offers is at all applicable in this case.

We are going to do the best we can in our committee to arrive at a better dairy program than we have had up to this time. I think it is possible to do it. I do not know whether we have the votes to do it or not. Some of us are going to try.

Mr. President, if there are no further requests for time, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, do I not have 4½ minutes?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct. He has 4½ minutes on his own amendment. Does the Senator from Minnesota wish to use that time now or following the vote on the substitute?

Mr. THYE. I will use the 4½ minutes now, and then we can vote on the substitute, and immediately following that on the amendment itself.

Mr. President, there is merit in the amendment which has been offered by my colleagues, the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] and the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY]. Therefore, it is impossible for me to vote "nay" on the amendment offered by my colleague, because last February 17 I introduced a bill designed to do much of what the amendment of the junior Senator from Minnesota and the senior Senator from Wisconsin proposes, which is

today resting in the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. The bill was cosponsored by 25 of my colleagues, and the list includes many of the outstanding senior Members of the Senate.

However, I think I am more consistent in my amendment. The Secretary of Agriculture stated that the Solicitor had informed him that he had to go to the 75-percent support level. I recognize that the President in his message to the joint session of Congress referred to price supports, and stated that he did not wish price supports to go down drastically, either dollarwise or percentage-wise. In my judgment a 5-percent reduction is a reasonable amount. At the same time, it would permit the Secretary to raise the support from 75 percent to 85 percent. So my amendment would give the Secretary of Agriculture the opportunity to go back to 85 percent price supports. It would be in line with what the President said in his message.

On the other hand, the amendment offered by the junior Senator from Minnesota and the senior Senator from Wisconsin would tie dairy products to the basic commodities. My colleague referred to feed grains. He is mistaken in referring to feed grains, because the amendment covers only basic commodities. Feed grains would include oats and barley. The amendment covers only basic commodities. I think it is too cumbersome to try to enact such an involved proposal as that contained in the amendment of my colleagues. Therefore, I wish the junior Senator from Minnesota would withdraw his amendment and allow the Senate to vote on the question of whether the Secretary of Agriculture should be able to reestablish 85 percent of parity as a support for dairy products.

Mr. President, that is all I have to say on this question. If I have any additional time, I surrender it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] for himself and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY].

Several Senators requested the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico will state it.

Mr. ANDERSON. Am I correct in understanding that all time for debate has expired?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time for debate has expired.

Mr. KNOWLAND. All time for debate has expired, and I have suggested the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Bricker	Capehart
Anderson	Bridges	Carlson
Barrett	Burke	Case
Beall	Bush	Chavez
Bennett	Butler, Md.	Clements
Bowring	Butler, Nebr.	Cooper

Cordon	Jackson	Mundt
Daniel	Jenner	Murray
Dirksen	Johnson, Colo.	Neely
Douglas	Johnson, Tex.	Pastore
Duff	Johnston, S. C.	Payne
Dworshak	Kefauver	Potter
Eastland	Kerr	Purtell
Ellender	Kilgore	Robertson
Ferguson	Knowland	Russell
Flanders	Kuchel	Saltonstall
Frear	Langer	Schoeppel
Fulbright	Lehman	Smathers
Gillette	Lennon	Smith, Maine
Goldwater	Long	Smith, N. J.
Gore	Magnuson	Sparkman
Green	Malone	Stennis
Hayden	Mansfield	Symington
Hendrickson	Martin	Thye
Hennings	Maybank	Upton
Hickenlooper	McCarran	Watkins
Hill	McCarthy	Welker
Hoey	McClellan	Wiley
Holland	Millikin	Williams
Humphrey	Monroney	Young
Ives	Morse	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] for himself and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY]. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CASE. Would it be fair to say that the amendment now pending relates to butter parity and other parities, whereas the amendment for which it is offered as a substitute, the amendment offered by the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], provides for a straight 5-percent limitation?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair regrets to state that he does not consider that a parliamentary inquiry, and, as the time for debate has elapsed, the Senate will now proceed with the vote.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, would it be out of order to request that the amendment be restated?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 8, line 10, it is proposed to insert the following:

SEC. 10. Section 201 of the Agricultural Act of 1949 (7 U. S. C., sec. 1446) is amended by inserting at the end of subsection (c) thereof the following:

"The price-support level for milk, butterfat, and the products of milk and butterfat for any year shall not be reduced by more than 5 percent of the actual price intended to be reflected to farmers by the support program for the preceding marketing year, except that such limitation does not apply to reductions due exclusively to changes in the parity index.

"Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the parity percentage level at which price supports for milk and butterfat and the products of milk and butterfat are provided shall not be less than the parity percentage level at which rigid mandatory price supports are provided for the basic commodities."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] are absent on official business.

I announce further that, if present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 32, nays 60, as follows:

YEAS—32		
Case	Johnston, S. C.	Morse
Chavez	Kefauver	Mundt
Clements	Kerr	Murray
Douglas	Kilgore	Neely
Eastland	Langer	Russell
Ellender	Lehman	Sparkman
Fulbright	Long	Symington
Hennings	Magnuson	Thye
Hill	Mansfield	Wiley
Humphrey	McCarthy	Young
Jackson	McClellan	

NAYS—60		
Aiken	Ferguson	Martin
Anderson	Flanders	Maybank
Barrett	Frear	McCarran
Beall	Gillette	Millikin
Bennett	Goldwater	Monroney
Bowring	Gore	Pastore
Bricker	Green	Payne
Bridges	Hayden	Potter
Burke	Hendrickson	Purtell
Bush	Hickenlooper	Robertson
Butler, Md.	Hoey	Saltonstall
Butler, Nebr.	Holland	Schoeppel
Capehart	Ives	Smathers
Carlson	Jenner	Smith, Maine
Cooper	Johnson, Colo.	Smith, N. J.
Cordon	Johnson, Tex.	Stennis
Daniel	Knowland	Upton
Dirksen	Kuchel	Watkins
Duff	Lennon	Welker
Dworshak	Malone	Williams

NOT VOTING—4		
Byrd	Hunt	Kennedy
George		

So the amendment of Mr. HUMPHREY and Mr. WILEY was rejected.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the Senate rejected the amendment offered by the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] for himself and on behalf of the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] be reconsidered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND's motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California will state it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. My understanding is that all time for debate has expired on the amendment offered by the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] for himself and on behalf of the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], and that the Senate may proceed to vote on the amendment. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] on behalf of himself and the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY].

The Senator from California has asked for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, how am I recorded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho is recorded as voting in the negative.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, how am I recorded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota is recorded as voting in the affirmative.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, how am I recorded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona is recorded as voting in the negative.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, how am I recorded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming is recorded as voting in the negative.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, how am I recorded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania is recorded as voting in the negative.

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, how am I recorded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland is recorded as voting in the negative.

Mr. SCHOEPEL. Mr. President, how am I recorded, please?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas is recorded as voting in the negative.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, how am I recorded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota is recorded as voting in the affirmative.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, how am I recorded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico is recorded as voting in the affirmative.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, how am I recorded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana is recorded as voting in the affirmative.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LONG. Whom are we waiting for? [Laughter.]

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] is necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] would vote "nay."

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] are absent on official business.

I announce further that, if present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 38, nays 53, as follows:

## YEAS—38

Burke	Humphrey	McCarthy
Case	Ives	McClellan
Chavez	Jackson	Monroney
Clements	Johnson, Tex.	Morse
Cooper	Johnston, S. C.	Mundt
Daniel	Kefauver	Murray
Douglas	Kerr	Neely
Eastland	Kilgore	Sparkman
Ellender	Langer	Symington
Fulbright	Lehman	Thye
Gillette	Long	Young
Hennings	Magnuson	Wiley
Hill	Mansfield	

## NAYS—53

Aiken	Flanders	Millikin
Anderson	Frear	Pastore
Barrett	Goldwater	Payne
Beall	Gore	Potter
Bennett	Green	Purtell
Bowring	Hayden	Robertson
Bricker	Hendrickson	Russell
Bridges	Hickenlooper	Saltonstall
Bush	Hoey	Schoepel
Butler, Md.	Holland	Smathers
Butler, Nebr.	Jenner	Smith, Maine
Capehart	Johnson, Colo.	Smith, N. J.
Carlson	Knowland	Stennis
Cordon	Kuchel	Upton
Dirksen	Lennon	Watkins
Duff	Martin	Welker
Dworshak	Maybank	Williams
Ferguson	McCarran	

## NOT VOTING—5

Byrd	Hunt	Malone
George	Kennedy	

So the amendment offered by Mr. THYE for himself and on behalf of Mr. IVES and Mr. MCCARTHY was rejected.

Mr. AIKEN. I move that the vote by which the amendment of the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] was rejected be reconsidered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I move to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from California.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I call up my amendment marked "4-14-54-B."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 3, in lines 3, 4, and 5, it is proposed to strike out the matter proposed to be inserted by the committee amendment and insert in lieu thereof the following:

Notwithstanding the foregoing, no price support through payments shall be made available at a level in excess of 100 percent of the parity price for the commodity; and no price support, other than through payments, shall be made available at a level in excess of 90 percent of the parity price for the commodity.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President—  
The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana is recognized.

Mr. ELLENDER. I hasten to advise the Senate that my amendment does not deal with anything other than wool.

As I stated on the floor of the Senate last week, wool has been supported in the past at a level ranging from 60 to 90 percent of parity. The bill before the Senate provides support at those levels and, in addition, provides a new method—production payments—to support the price of wool, and stimulate its production.

That second method—that is, direct-production payments—would give the Secretary of Agriculture the right, by and with the consent and advice of the growers of wool, to fix a price on wool which would result in the production of 300 million pounds, an amount deemed desirable, and which is cited as the objective of this bill.

Mr. President, under this method, the support price can range from 90 percent to 150 percent or even higher. The only limitation is the amount of tariff collected; the bill provides that payments may not exceed 70 percent of tariff collections on wool.

I do not know of a commodity supported in the past which has been accorded the treatment it is proposed to give producers of wool. Wool producers have been very well treated in the past. In 1946 wool producers were assisted pricewise by virtue of loans made under authority of the then existing Delaware Charter of the Commodity Credit Corporation. Later, in 1947, the wool growers were provided for by a separate act. In 1949 they were included in the act which is presently on the statute books. Wool was considered in the same bill which related to cotton, corn, wheat, and other basic commodities—as well as with nonbasic commodities.

Today wool producers of this country are protected at a range of from 60 to 90 percent of parity. It is discretionary with the Secretary of Agriculture to impose supports of from 60 to 90 percent of parity. It strikes me that the wool-growers of this country should be well satisfied if the price supports paid to them are limited to 100 percent of parity, and that is the purpose of my amendment. It is simply to limit to 100 percent of parity the direct production payments to woolgrowers, payments made possible under the second method to which I referred earlier.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield to the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Is it not also a fact that for many years there has been spent about \$900,000 a year by the Fish and Wildlife Service, primarily for the benefit of the sheepgrowers of the West, in order to protect the sheep from the depredations of coyotes and mountain lions?

Mr. ELLENDER. I do not know, but I assume the Senator is correct.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I do know, because I have examined those funds very closely. The funds which have been spent in past years amounted to about \$900,000 a year, and that amount is provided for in the budget again this year.

I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Louisiana if there is any material difference between this plan of subsidy and what is known as the Brannan plan on wheat, corn, and other basic commodities.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I understand, in the Brannan plan it was intended to make direct payments to producers, and those payments would be based on whatever price was fixed for the commodity in the marketplace. In this particular

case, as the bill now stands, the Secretary would have the producers of wool agree on the price which they deem they should receive in order to encourage the production of 300 million pounds of wool per year. If the Secretary should determine that level, that price, to be 110 percent of parity, and the wool growers were receiving 80 percent of parity in the marketplace, the Government would pay from the Treasury the difference between the market price and 110 percent of parity—in this example, it would be 30 percent. These payments would be direct payments made to the wool producers and the only limitation, as I stated a while ago, would be the amount of money made available through 70 percent of the revenues obtained by way of the tariffs on wool.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Is it not true that the committee report shows that 70 percent of the tariff would produce \$45 or \$50 million a year; and that could result in increasing the payment, if the Secretary saw fit to do so, to 150 percent or 160 percent of parity, if the Secretary of Agriculture wished to use the full amount available?

Mr. ELLENDER. Of course, if the amount available were sufficient, the Secretary could conceivably set the levels that high. However, my understanding is it would be more probable that the \$45 million would make possible production payments approximating 110 or 115 percent of parity.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I understand the Senate has rejected the amendment providing for 90 percent of parity for the basic commodities.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The Senator from Louisiana now takes the position that he is willing to have 100 percent of parity provided for wool, but that is as far as he will go. Do I correctly understand his position?

Mr. ELLENDER. Exactly; that is my position.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield to me?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Is not the Senator from Virginia correct when he says that all we are doing now, in the case of the wool bill, even if we adopt the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana, is to accept the Brannan plan about which everyone was complaining?

Mr. ELLENDER. The method of payment to the producers of wool is a direct one. As I understand, that was the method by which the so-called Brannan plan was to be administered.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. In other words, the farmers would produce the commodities, sell them on the market—

Mr. CHAVEZ. In this instance, the commodity would be wool, would it not?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes. As I have just indicated, under the provisions of the bill, the wool would be sold on the market at whatever price it would bring, and the producer would be paid by our Government the difference between that price and whatever support level had been set by the Secretary.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. If the price fixed by the Secretary of Agriculture, by and with the consent of the wool growers, happened to be, let us say, 70 cents a pound, and if the wool growers could get only 50 cents a pound on the market, the Government would pay out of the Treasury the difference, or 20 cents a pound.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Was not that the proposal under the Brannan plan?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes; as I understand, that is exactly what was proposed under the Brannan plan.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield to me for a question?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Will the Senator from Louisiana inform me what the average customs receipts on wool are expected to be?

Mr. ELLENDER. As I recall, the record shows they are expected to be in the neighborhood of between \$40 million and \$45 million.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is that the estimate of the total receipts?

Mr. ELLENDER. Those are approximately the total receipts now.

Mr. DOUGLAS. They are the total receipts, are they?

Mr. ELLENDER. As I recall the figures, yes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Do I correctly understand that 70 percent of those receipts would be earmarked as the subsidy for wool?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. So probably \$32 million would be distributed as a cash subsidy to the wool growers. Is that correct?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct, assuming custom receipts are at the level I mentioned.

Mr. DOUGLAS. And it would be apportioned on the basis of a 300-million-pound annual clip of wool, would it?

Mr. ELLENDER. No; only if that much wool were produced. The bill goes on to say that wool is a strategic material, and that the bill is intended to cause the growers to produce as much as 300 million pounds annually. That is the goal. The plan is to fix a price that will encourage the production of that amount of wool. That price, as I stated awhile ago, may be 65, 70, or 75 cents a pound—whatever price is agreed upon as one which will cause wool producers to produce that commodity up to the goal set—that is, 300 million pounds a year. The only limitation as to supports paid would be the amount collected from the tariff on wool.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Assuming that 70 percent of the customs receipts on wool is rebated—amounting to \$32,500,000—and assuming that the annual wool clip is 300 million pounds, that will mean a cash subsidy of approximately 11 cents a pound, will it not?

Mr. ELLENDER. Has the Senator from Illinois figured it at that amount?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes; it is approximately 11 cents.

Assuming that the domestic price were allowed to fall to the world price level, will the Senator from Louisiana inform the Senate how much the support would

be if the cash subsidy were added to the domestic price, which then would be the world price?

Mr. ELLENDER. The price today, as I understand, is 42 cents a pound; assuming that is the price at which the farmer sells his wool, then he will receive from the Government the difference between that price and the price previously agreed upon—and agreed upon before he produced the wool.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does the Senator from Louisiana mean this arrangement may entail Government purchase and storage, also?

Mr. ELLENDER. No, because the wool would be sold on the free market, the open market; and it would be purchased by consumers of wool—by the wool mills, I assume.

Mr. DOUGLAS. What I am trying to get at is this: If the domestic price is allowed to fall to the world price level, which the Senator from Louisiana says is 42 cents a pound, and if a cash subsidy of 11 cents a pound is added to it, the total amount received by the growers will be 53 cents a pound, will it not?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes, assuming that the figures of the Senator from Illinois are correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Will the Senator from Louisiana inform me what percentage of parity that would be?

Mr. ELLENDER. It would be less than 100 percent of parity.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It would be less than 100 percent of parity, would it?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes, because at the moment, as I recall, the parity figure is approximately 60 cents a pound. Thus 100 percent of parity would equal approximately 60 cents a pound.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Evidently the Senator from Louisiana is apprehensive that, in practice, the wool growers will receive 110 percent of parity.

Mr. ELLENDER. The point is that the Secretary of Agriculture will fix the price far in advance of the production of wool—at least 1 year in advance—in order to encourage production. If the price fixed is, let us say, 65 cents a pound, and if the price on the world market is 42 cents a pound, the amount paid by the Government to the wool growers of the United States will be the difference between 42 and 65 cents a pound.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Will the total amount of the payments be limited by the provision regarding 70 percent of the tariff on wool?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes, it will.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Suppose 70 percent of the tariff or custom receipts on wool is not sufficient to make up the difference between the domestic price and the world price.

Mr. ELLENDER. Of course, there is a definite limitation to 70 percent of the tariff receipts from wool. But the Senator from Illinois must bear in mind that wool production has been curtailed considerably in the last few years, and today the wool producers are far from the present production goal. So instead of utilizing 70 percent of the custom receipts in connection with the production of 300 million pounds for the first year, they probably will use the available

amount in connection with the production of only 110 million pounds or 125 million pounds. In other words, there will be a gradual increase of production until the 300-million-pound goal is reached.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Will the Senator from Louisiana yield to me for a further question?

Mr. ELLENDER. Certainly.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Therefore, the Senator from Louisiana is apprehensive, is he not, that instead of a domestic clip of 300 million pounds, the actual clip or production would be appreciably less than that, so that the price would rise above the 42 cents or 43 cents which would be the world price; and if then the 11 cents a pound, or whatever the amount might be, were added, the total amount received by the woolgrowers would be above parity, would it not?

Mr. ELLENDER. It is possible that more than 11 cents a pound would be added.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I see. In other words, that would occur with a smaller volume of total production, would it not?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes. If the revenues from 70 percent of the tariff on wool were to amount to \$33 million, and if only 150 million pounds of wool were produced, the payment could be as high as 22 cents a pound.

As I have said, under the terms of the bill, all that is left to the Secretary of Agriculture. He would call in the woolgrowers. They would discuss the matter, and whatever amount is agreed upon as necessary to encourage the production of the 300-million-pound goal the Secretary would have the authority to fix that amount as the support level. I repeat that the only limitation is the amount of money which 70 percent of the tariffs will yield.

Mr. President, as was suggested a moment ago by my good friend from Mississippi, the Senate has voted down an amendment proposed by me extending for 1 year the 90 percent of parity price supports on our basic crops. In the case of wool under this bill, the support level does not stop at 90 percent. It can go to 110 or 125 percent. I predict that if the bill is enacted into law, not only will it encourage wool growers in the West and the North to produce more wool, but we can expect the South to go into the production of wool. The bill, as I interpret it, would guarantee to the producers of wool more than 100 percent of parity. It strikes me that the woolgrowers should be well satisfied to limit the price that can be fixed by the Secretary of Agriculture to 100 percent of parity.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT].

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, the senior Senator from Louisiana opened his remarks with the statement that his amendment applied to wool alone. In that he is eminently correct, for the very simple reason that there is no

limitation upon the support price which may be accorded to any other agricultural commodity. He is singling out wool and saying by his amendment that under no set of circumstances may the Secretary go beyond 100 percent, whereas under existing law there is no limitation with respect to any other agricultural commodity. I think that is eminently unfair.

I think it is unfair for another reason. The parity on wool happens to be unreasonably low. There are three reasons for that. In the first instance, it was set on the basis of the years 1910 to 1914. In those years we had some free trade practices in this country, and the price of wool was down.

In the second place, contrary to the statements made by the Senator from Louisiana, wool was frozen at a level which forced the wool producers to take a loss of 10 cents on every pound of wool they produced. It was the only commodity frozen at such a low level. Every other agricultural commodity had the benefit of increases.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARRETT. The fact that OPA set the support price on wool at 41 cents at the time of the attack upon Pearl Harbor and maintained it throughout the war years has adversely affected parity on wool.

In the third place, we find ourselves in the position that operations with respect to practically every other agricultural commodity have been mechanized, and a good deal of labor has been dispensed with. However, that has been impossible in the wool industry. As a consequence, under the present parity formula, there is small inducement to labor. Labor costs in connection with wool are 25 percent of total costs. The upshot of the matter is that parity on wool is probably the worst formula applied to any agricultural commodity.

It seems to me that since section 402 of the act of 1949, which is the present law, provides that all agricultural commodities may be supported at any figure the Secretary determines is necessary above 90 percent or above 100 percent, and since the bill adopts a similar policy, certainly the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana is unfair.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARRETT. I am glad to yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. The example to which the Senator refers is a case of emergency. However, under the terms of the pending bill, the authority would be utilized during an emergency or any other time.

Mr. BARRETT. Let me say to the distinguished Senator that it is precisely for the same reason—

Mr. ELLENDER. Under the terms of the bill, whether there is an emergency or not, the goal is to produce 300 million pounds; and to achieve that goal the Secretary can fix the support level at any price he desires, with the consent of the growers, provided the production payments do not exceed 70 percent of the tariffs.

Mr. BARRETT. Let me say to the Senator that the language of the bill is such that the Secretary of Agriculture—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Wyoming has expired.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes more to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. BARRETT. As I have said, the purpose of the wool bill is to support wool at an incentive level, for the very simple reason that it is a strategic material necessary for the defense of America. For that reason the Secretary is empowered to establish a level, after a hearing, which will tend to bring about a production amounting to 300 million pounds of wool.

Let me cite the language with respect to other commodities:

SEC. 402. Notwithstanding any other provision of this act, price support at a level in excess of the maximum level of price support otherwise prescribed in this act may be made available for any agricultural commodity if the Secretary determines, after a public hearing of which reasonable notice has been given, that price support at such increased level is necessary in order to prevent or alleviate a shortage in the supply of any agricultural commodity essential to the national welfare or in order to increase or maintain the production of any agricultural commodity in the interest of national security. The Secretary's determination and the record of the hearing shall be available to the public. (Oct. 31, 1949, Public Law 439, 81st Cong., 63 Stat. 1051, 1054; 7 U. S. C., sec. 1422.)

I submit that the same reasoning applies to the wool bill as applies to the particular language in section 402.

Mr. ELLENDER. Wool is included in the law from which the Senator is reading.

Mr. BARRETT. That is true. However, by the language of the wool bill which is before us wool would be taken out of that section.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator seeks to make permanent law of the emergency law from which he read.

Mr. BARRETT. If the Senator wishes to yield me more time I shall be glad to discuss the question with him.

Mr. President, let me say in closing that the Senator from Louisiana stated to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] that if the production of wool amounted to 300 million pounds, payments might be made to the tune of 11 cents a pound. When production reaches 300 million pounds, there will be no payments. So I think it is a bit unfair for the Senator to maintain that wool ought to be singled out and treated in a manner entirely different from the manner in which other agricultural commodities are treated.

I should like to say a word further about the Brannan plan, which has been mentioned. The objection to the payments under the Brannan plan came about because an attempt was made to regiment the woolgrowers of the country, and to limit the number of sheep they might run, as well as the size of the farms they might operate. Furthermore, it was sought to place a limitation upon their total cash income. That was

the objection, in the main, to the Branman plan, which was submitted to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Wyoming has expired.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I yield 4 minutes to the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL].

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I wish to make a brief statement in support of S. 2911.

As is well known, Mr. President, we of Massachusetts and New England have many men and women who are dependent upon their jobs in the woolen and worsted industry, both in the manufacture of woolen and worsted products and also in the Boston wool trade.

The Boston wool trade is known the world over as the largest handler of grease wool in this country. It stands as the middleman between the grower and the mill which ultimately uses the wool. Approximately two-thirds of the wool used in this country is imported. Less than one-third is grown in this country. In recent years the Government has taken wool from the growers under support programs, and much of this wool has not gone directly into consumption but has been held in the warehouses for Government accounts.

The purpose of this bill is to try and facilitate the movement of domestically grown wool directly through the various trade agencies and wool processes into the manufactured product. It is also intended to encourage the production of domestic wool.

Consistently with the position of the Boston wool trade, I favor all responsible proposals for increasing the production of wool in the United States. I believe that the method of price support contemplated by this bill will encourage the production of domestic wool. This bill will be helpful in permitting domestic wool to enter trade channels at normal market prices rather than to be accumulated in large Government stockpiles with an inevitably disturbing effect upon the market.

Mr. President, the situation in the manufacture of wool is not a happy one. Many of our fine mills have been liquidated. Many of our skilled textile workers, both men and women in Massachusetts, can no longer find the employment which they desire in the woolen and worsted mills.

The bill which is now before the Senate will help employment, or at least assist in preventing further employment, in the woolen textile manufacturing industry. It is not simply a bill for the assistance of wool growers. It will help the woolen textile manufacturing industry by holding down the price of raw wool which is, of course, a major factor in the cost of producing woolen textiles. Until the introduction of this bill, the wool growers had been pressing vigorously for an increase in the tariff on raw wool. Without such an increase, they argued, they would be forced to make further reductions in their herds, thus defeating the purpose of the Agricultural Act of 1949 in encouraging the domestic production of wool. On this ground, the Tariff Commission recom-

mended the imposition of import fees of 10 cents a pound on raw wool.

The announced aim of the recommended import fees was to increase the price of all wool consumed in this country. This would have had two consequences, both disastrous, on the woolen textile manufacturing industry. First, the industry is already hard-pressed by imports of finished woolen and worsted goods, and by increasing the domestic industry's raw materials costs, import fees would make it still more difficult for the industry to meet the competition of foreign manufacturers. To offset this impact of import fees, the Commission, it is true, also recommended compensatory increases in the tariff on finished woolen textiles, but this recommendation simply highlights the other adverse impact of the Commission's action on the domestic woolen textile industry: namely, impairment of its ability to compete with synthetics.

It has been argued, I know, that the manufacture of synthetics will ultimately increase the demand for wool, because most synthetics include some proportion of wool. Be that as it may, it is clear that the volume of wool consumed will be lower if the price is increased by 10 cents a pound than if domestic production of wool is encouraged in some other way.

The means of increasing the production of wool adopted by this bill amounts to a direct subsidy payment to the grower. I fully recognize, and indeed sympathize with, the objections in principle to such a subsidy. However, so far as the consumer is concerned, the imposition of import fees would be no less a subsidy to the grower than the direct payments provided for by this bill. If, then, we are to choose between the alternatives of increasing import fees and direct payments, the considerations that I have already outlined make the latter preferable.

Pending action on the bill now under consideration, the President has held up action on the Tariff Commissioner's recommendations. In my judgment, therefore, it is in the essential interest of the woolen textile-manufacturing industry to support this bill. I shall do so gladly, Mr. President, knowing that it is at the same time in the best interests of the woolgrowers of our Western States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER].

Mr. ELLENDER. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Case	Frear
Anderson	Chavez	Fulbright
Barrett	Clements	Gillette
Beall	Cooper	Goldwater
Bennett	Cordon	Gore
Bowring	Daniel	Green
Bricker	Dirksen	Hayden
Bridges	Douglas	Hendrickson
Burke	Duff	Hennings
Bush	Dworshak	Hickenlooper
Butler, Md.	Eastland	Hill
Butler, Nebr.	Ellender	Hoyer
Capehart	Ferguson	Holland
Carlson	Flanders	Humphrey

Ives	Malone	Russell
Jackson	Mansfield	Saltonstall
Jenner	Martin	Schoepfel
Johnson, Colo.	McCarran	Smathers
Johnson, Tex.	McCarthy	Smith, Maine
Johnston, S. C.	McClellan	Smith, N. J.
Kefauver	Millikin	Sparkman
Kerr	Monroney	Stennis
Kilgore	Mundt	Symington
Knowland	Murray	Thye
Kuchel	Neely	Upton
Langer	Pastore	Watkins
Lehman	Payne	Welker
Lennon	Potter	Williams
Long	Purtell	Young
Magnuson	Robertson	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I request the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] are necessarily absent.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] are absent on official business.

I announce further that, if present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 23, nays 66, as follows:

## YEAS—23

Chavez	Hill	Monroney
Douglas	Johnston, S. C.	Neely
Eastland	Kefauver	Robertson
Ellender	Kerr	Russell
Fulbright	Langer	Smathers
Gillette	Lehman	Sparkman
Gore	Long	Stennis
Hennings	McClellan	

## NAYS—66

Aiken	Ferguson	Mansfield
Anderson	Flanders	Martin
Barrett	Frear	McCarran
Beall	Goldwater	McCarthy
Bennett	Green	Millikin
Bowring	Hayden	Mundt
Bricker	Hendrickson	Murray
Bridges	Hickenlooper	Pastore
Burke	Hoyer	Payne
Bush	Holland	Potter
Butler, Md.	Humphrey	Purtell
Butler, Nebr.	Ives	Saltonstall
Capehart	Jackson	Schoepfel
Carlson	Jenner	Smith, Maine
Case	Johnson, Colo.	Smith, N. J.
Clements	Johnson, Tex.	Symington
Cooper	Kilgore	Thye
Cordon	Knowland	Upton
Daniel	Kuchel	Watkins
Dirksen	Lennon	Welker
Duff	Magnuson	Williams
Dworshak	Malone	Young

## NOT VOTING—7

Byrd	Kennedy	Wiley
George	Maybank	
Hunt	Morse	

So Mr. ELLENDER's amendment was rejected.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] was rejected.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I move that that motion be laid on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from California, that the

motion of the Senator from Vermont be laid on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated. The amendment is offered in behalf of myself, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma.

The CHIEF CLERK. On the first page, between lines 2 and 3, it is proposed to insert "TITLE I" and in line 3 strike out "That this act" and insert in lieu thereof "SEC. 1. This title."

On page 2, line 23; page 4, line 24; page 5, line 18; page 6, lines 4 and 15; strike out "act" and insert in lieu thereof "title."

On page 8, after line 9, insert a new title, as follows:

#### TITLE II

SEC. 201. (a) Title II of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof a new section as follows:

"SEC. 202. Notwithstanding any other provision of the law the Secretary is authorized and directed to make immediately available through loans, purchases, payments, or other operations under existing law, price support to producers of beef cattle at 90 percent of parity."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from Oklahoma state how long he wishes to speak on the amendment?

Mr. KERR. I yield 5 minutes to myself, Mr. President.

The purpose of this amendment is to require the Secretary of Agriculture immediately to place into effect the support program on the price of cattle at 90 percent of parity. Under the present law, the Secretary has the authority to put into effect such a program, and for many months, under the guise of doing so, he has been spending considerable sums of money. As I understand, up to this time the Secretary of Agriculture has spent upward of \$100 million in buying processed meat, hamburger, and canned gravy at a price, Mr. President, which has provided a boon and bonanza to the packers but which has in no way helped the producer of cattle.

The purpose of this amendment is to require the Secretary of Agriculture to put the program into effect on a basis which will benefit the producer.

Mr. President, the entire agricultural economy is tied to the value of livestock, of cattle. In the State of Oklahoma over half the income of the farmers has been from the sale of beef and dairy products.

Therefore, when the price of cattle was reduced last fall and winter to a level of 50 percent of parity or less on many grades of live cattle it meant that by one development alone the agricultural income of the State was reduced by 25 percent.

Mr. President, the producer of cattle must pay 90 percent of parity for all of the feed which is bought by him to feed his cattle. I ask this question: How can so large a segment of our agricultural

population pay 90 percent of parity for the feed which animals eat and sell the animals at from 50 percent to 60 percent of parity and still avoid inevitable bankruptcy?

Mr. President, we know that the price of the basic commodities will continue to be supported either at the figures now provided by law or at figures which later will be provided and legislated by Congress. Yet, under the policies of the Secretary of Agriculture at this time, the price of cattle has not been supported.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I yield myself an additional 3 minutes.

The Secretary of Agriculture has refused to support the price of cattle. He has given notice that he has no purpose to do so. Therefore, the cattle producer faces a future which is bleak to the extent that his impoverishment or bankruptcy is certain. He faces a future wherein he knows the prices of the basic commodities, including the feed for his cattle, are going to be supported at from 75 percent to 90 percent of parity. Yet he is confronted with a situation in which the Secretary of Agriculture has spent all the money allocated to this program in a way which has benefited only the packer, and not the producer.

Therefore, Mr. President, from the standpoint of the economy of the cattle producer, from the standpoint of the future welfare of the entire support program, from the standpoint of the economy of the States in the agricultural area, and from the standpoint of simple justice, the cattle producer is entitled to have this amendment agreed to by the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, the amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma simply embodies the proposal which he has made to the Senate time and again. I think that every Member of the Senate has made up his mind on the question.

If the Senator from Oklahoma will relinquish the rest of his time, I will relinquish the time of the opponents of the amendment, so that the Senate may reach a vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma was rejected.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I move that that motion be laid on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from California.

The motion of the Senator from California to lay on the table the motion of the Senator from Vermont was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I ask for the yeas and nays on final passage of the bill. The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gillette	Mansfield
Anderson	Goldwater	Martin
Barrett	Gore	McCarran
Beall	Green	McClellan
Bennett	Hayden	Mills
Bowring	Hendrickson	Monroney
Bricker	Hennings	Mundt
Bridges	Hickenlooper	Murray
Burke	Hill	Neely
Bush	Hoey	Pastore
Butler, Md.	Holland	Payne
Butler, Nebr.	Humphrey	Potter
Capehart	Ives	Purtell
Carlson	Jackson	Robertson
Case	Jenner	Russell
Chavez	Johnson, Colo.	Saltonstall
Clements	Johnson, Tex.	Schoeppel
Cooper	Johnston, S. C.	Smathers
Cordon	Kefauver	Smith, Maine
Daniel	Kerr	Smith, N. J.
Dirksen	Kilgore	Sparkman
Douglas	Knowland	Stennis
Duff	Kuchel	Symington
Dworshak	Langer	Thye
Eastland	Lehman	Upton
Ellender	Lennon	Watkins
Ferguson	Long	Welker
Frear	Magnuson	Williams
Fulbright	Malone	Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

The question is on the final passage of the bill. The yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to ask both the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], who has control of half the time for debate on the bill, and the acting minority leader [Mr. CLEMENTS], who has control of the other half of the time, whether they are prepared to waive the remainder of their time.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, if the acting minority leader, or the majority leader on the other side, as he is sometimes called, will waive the remainder of the time which is allotted to that side, I shall be glad to waive the remainder of the time allotted to this side.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I have been looking for the senior Senator from Louisiana, in order to determine whether he wishes to make a statement on the bill.

#### LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, while all the Senators are here, I should like to make a brief announcement of the program for tomorrow and the rest of the week. If the Senator from Vermont will yield me enough time for that purpose, I think all Senators will be interested in knowing the program for the balance of the week.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I think it is only fair to state that either of us will yield to the majority leader such time as he

needs, and will also yield to other Members such time as they may need to request that various matters be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Once the Senate has taken a final vote on the pending bill, I shall be prepared to move that the Senate take a recess, except for having the Senate remain in session in order to permit insertions to be made in the RECORD or to permit Senators to make any remarks they may desire to make.

Upon completion of action on the wool bill, I shall move that the Senate proceed to consider House bill 8481, Calendar No. 1223, making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954; but it is not intended to have the Senate debate the bill before tomorrow.

#### DEVELOPMENT OF THE DOMESTIC WOOL INDUSTRY

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2911) to provide for the development of a sound and profitable domestic wool industry under our national policy of expanding world trade, to encourage increased domestic production of wool for our national security, and for other purposes.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I should like to renew my inquiry as to whether the Senators in control of the time on the bill are prepared to yield their remaining time.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, so far as I am concerned, I yield the time available to this side, and I am ready to have the vote taken.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I am willing to yield the time available to this side, and I do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that the remaining time has been waived by both sides.

The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. RUSSELL (when his name was called). On this vote, I have a pair with the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "nay." I withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] are necessarily absent.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] are absent on official business.

I announce further that on this vote the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is paired with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Virginia would vote "nay" and the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "yea."

I announce also that on this vote the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT] is paired with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK]. If present and voting, the Senator from Wyoming would vote "yea" and the Senator from South Carolina would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 69, nays 17, as follows:

#### YEAS—69

Aiken	Ferguson	Long
Anderson	Gillette	Magnuson
Barrett	Goldwater	Malone
Beall	Green	Mansfield
Bennett	Hayden	McCarran
Bowring	Hendrickson	Millikin
Bricker	Hennings	Mundt
Bridges	Hickenlooper	Murray
Burke	Hill	Neely
Bush	Hoey	Pastore
Butler, Md.	Holland	Payne
Butler, Nebr.	Humphrey	Potter
Capehart	Ives	Purtell
Carlson	Jackson	Saltonstall
Case	Jenner	Schoeppel
Chavez	Johnson, Colo.	Smith, Maine
Clements	Johnson, Tex.	Smith, N. J.
Cooper	Johnston, S. C.	Sparkman
Cordon	Kefauver	Symington
Daniel	Kilgore	Thye
Dirksen	Knowland	Upton
Duff	Kuchel	Watkins
Eastland	Langer	Young

#### NAYS—17

Douglas	Kerr	Robertson
Dworshak	Lehman	Smathers
Ellender	Lennon	Stennis
Frear	Martin	Welker
Fulbright	McClellan	Williams
Gore	Monroney	

#### NOT VOTING—10

Byrd	Kennedy	Russell
Flanders	Maybank	Wiley
George	McCarthy	
Hunt	Morse	

So the bill (S. 2911) was passed.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the bill was passed be reconsidered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I move to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from California.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

#### NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON PROPOSED SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION LEGISLATION

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, there are pending before the Subcommittee on Education of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare a number of bills providing for Federal financial assistance to the States for the construction of public elementary and secondary school facilities.

In my capacity as chairman of that subcommittee, I desire to give notice that public hearings on these measures have been scheduled to begin at 10:00 a. m., on May 11. The hearings will be held in the District of Columbia Committee room, P-38-C, in the Capitol.

I consider the matter of the provision of proper educational facilities for the

34 million school children of the country one of the most important responsibilities of the Nation.

Organizations and interested individuals desiring to be heard should notify the committee promptly, so that the schedule of witnesses may be completed.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I wish to commend my colleague, the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], for setting the date for the hearings on the school construction bills which now are before the Education Subcommittee of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. I would be remiss if I did not express my interest in the school construction measures, for I introduced one in January 1953; and I live in a State that probably needs Federal aid for school construction more than does any other State in the Union. I also am a firm believer that this is the right step in connection with providing Federal aid for education in the United States.

#### SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1954

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, as previously announced, I now intend to move that House bill 8481, Calendar 1223, the supplemental appropriations bill, be made the unfinished business, although it is not the intention to have the bill debated this afternoon.

Therefore, Mr. President, I now move that the Senate proceed to consider House bill 8481, Calendar 1223, making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 8481) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

#### RECESS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate now stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 18 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, April 28, 1954, at 12 o'clock meridian.

#### NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 27 (legislative day of April 14), 1954:

##### DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Livingston Satterthwaite, of Pennsylvania, for promotion from Foreign Service officer of class 2 to class 1.

Cloyce K. Huston, of Iowa, for promotion from Foreign Service officer of class 2 to class 1 and to be also a consul general of the United States of America.

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion from class 3 to class 2:

Clarence Boonstra, of Louisiana.  
Horatio Mooers, of Maine.  
R. Smith Simpson, of Virginia.  
Carroll M. Terry, of Alabama.

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion from class 4 to class 3:

David M. Bane, of Pennsylvania.  
Rodger P. Davies, of California.  
Henry L. T. Koren, of New Jersey.  
Francis E. Meloy, Jr., of Maryland.  
Richard E. Usher, of Wisconsin.

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion from class 5 to class 4:

Stephen H. McClintic, of Maryland.  
Charles M. Urruela, of Ohio.

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion from class 5 to class 4 and to be also consuls of the United States of America:

John C. Amott, of New Jersey.  
Hugh G. Appling, of California.  
Philip Axelrod, of Delaware.  
William D. Brewer, of Connecticut.  
Edwin D. Crowley, of Virginia.  
John B. Dexter, of Maryland.  
Herbert Gordon, of New York.  
John Calvin Hill, Jr., of South Carolina.  
Peter Hooper, Jr., of Massachusetts.  
Rogers B. Horgan, of Massachusetts.  
John M. Howison, of Texas.  
Max V. Krebs, of California.  
Richard H. Lamb, of Washington.  
James F. Leonard, Jr., of Pennsylvania.  
Matthew J. Loomam, Jr., of New York.  
Francis N. Magliozzi, of Massachusetts.  
Robert M. Phillips, of California.  
Paul O. Proehl, of Illinois.  
Robert W. Ross, of California.  
Sidney Sober, of New York.  
Harrison M. Symmes, Jr., of North Carolina.  
Viron P. Vaky, of Texas.  
Stephen Winship, of Massachusetts.  
Chalmers B. Wood, of the District of Columbia.

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion from class 6 to class 5:

Emerson M. Brown, of Michigan.  
William P. E. Graves, of the District of Columbia.  
Robert A. Hurwitch, of Illinois.  
John M. Kane, of Illinois.  
Donald E. Larimore, of Illinois.  
Francis J. Meehan, of the District of Columbia.

Donald D. Edgar, of New Jersey, now a Foreign Service officer of class 2 and a secretary in the diplomatic service, to be also a consul general of the United States of America.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 1, consuls, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Durward V. Sandifer, of Illinois.  
Robert P. Terrill, of California.

Mallory Browne, of Virginia, for appointment as a Foreign Service officer of class 2, a consul, and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 3, consuls, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Robert N. Anderson, of California.  
Coburn B. Kidd, of Oklahoma.  
Joseph Sweeney, of California.  
Percy de F. Warner, of the District of Columbia.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 4, consuls, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Chester E. Beaman, of Indiana.  
H. Reid Bird, of Utah.  
Davis Eugene Boster, of Ohio.  
G. Edward Clark, of New York.  
Robert Donhauser, of New York.  
Charles C. Finch, of Ohio.  
Miss Constance L. Grant, of Massachusetts.  
Albert Harkness, Jr., of Rhode Island.

L. Douglas Heck, of Maryland.  
Valdemar N. L. Johnson, of Florida.  
William B. Kelly, of Ohio.  
Terrance G. Leonhardy, of North Dakota.  
Frederic K. Lundy, Jr., of Virginia.  
Harold M. Midkiff, of Florida.  
Lynn H. Olson, of Minnesota.  
Givon Parsons, of Texas.  
Robert H. Shields, of California.  
Charles Wilson Thomas, of Utah.  
Mrs. Musedorah W. Thoreson, of Tennessee.  
William L. Wight, Jr., of Virginia.  
Eibert R. Williams, of Pennsylvania.

#### SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

A. Jackson Goodwin, of Alabama, to be a member of the Securities and Exchange Commission for the term expiring June 5, 1959 (reappointment).

#### IN THE COAST GUARD

The following-named cadets to be ensigns in the United States Coast Guard:

Robert Bruce Bacon  
Robert Charles Benson  
Terry "F" Blair  
Sylvan Charles Bloch  
William Frederick Boucher  
Raymond Joseph Boyd, Jr.  
Alfred Fearing Bridgman, Jr.  
Michael Taylor Brock  
Richard Tutchings Brower, Jr.  
Gerald John Budridge  
Gaetano James Catalano  
Robert Charles Chanaud  
Charles Lewis Clark  
Earl Wilbert Clark, Jr.  
Raymond John Copin  
Jack Emerson Coulter  
Verne Edward Cox  
Norman Graham Cubberly  
James Filmore Culbertson  
Philip Joseph Danahy  
Arnold Melvin Danielsen  
George William Dick, Jr.  
Denis Edward Dougherty  
James Irving Doughty  
Roger Alden Eastman  
Arthur Henry Edmunds, Jr.  
Richard Vaughan Elms, Jr.  
James Leo Fear  
James McHugh Fournier  
Robert Tracy Getman  
Richard Carl Groepfer  
Robert Leonard Guibord  
Charles Farrell Hahn  
Robert Richard Hovener  
James Lee Howard  
Addison Spencer Jennings  
Ralph Waverly Judd  
Richard George Kerr  
John Richard Kirkland  
William Patrick Kozlovsky  
Arthur Edward Ladley, Jr.  
Lawrence David Levine  
Henry Lohmann  
Kenneth Alan Long  
George Preston Lord  
Francis Cleland Lottridge  
Clyde Thomas Lusk, Jr.  
Walter Emil Mason, Jr.  
Ernest John Mayer, Jr.  
Joseph Anthony McDonough, Jr.  
Edward Andrew McGee  
Mark John Millea  
Guy Wallace Mizell  
Francis Henry Mollin  
Rex Rothe Morgan  
James Calvin Morrow  
John Edgar Moseley  
William Craig Nolan  
Edwin Lyle Parker  
John Paul Prosser  
William Andrew Publicover  
Dwight Timmons Ramsay  
John William Reece  
Albert Emil Reif, Jr.  
Billy Eugene Richardson  
Clyde "E" Robbins  
Victor Roger Robillard  
Henry Joseph Roehner, Jr.  
John George Schaefer, Jr.

Paul Edward Schroeder  
George Taylor Seaman  
William Turner Sheppard  
William McCrossan Sillers, Jr.  
John Pierce Skillings  
Wayne Croom Stansill  
Crook Stewart, Jr.  
Donald Lewis Stivender  
Arthur Joseph St. John  
Milton Yovo Suzich  
Carlton Walter Swickley  
Donald MacGregor Thomson, Jr.  
William James Tillo  
Albert Charles Tingley, Jr.  
Paul Totten  
Paul Albert Trimmer  
Thomas Richard Tyler  
John David Van Horn  
George Herbert Wagner  
John Mortimer Wilkinson  
James Arthur Wilson  
Richard Byrd Wise

#### IN THE NAVY

Charles R. Greene, Jr., Midshipman (Naval Academy), to be ensign in the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law.

Chester R. Oberg, Midshipman (Naval Academy), to be ensign in the Navy, in lieu of ensign in the Supply Corps in the Navy as previously nominated.

Philip W. Cronk, Midshipman (Naval Academy), to be ensign in the Supply Corps in the Navy, in lieu of ensign in the Navy as previously nominated.

Robert R. Thomley, Midshipman (Naval Academy), to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law.

The following-named (Naval ROTC) to be ensigns in the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

James G. Abert	Alfred J. Boulos
Harold E. Aletto	Thomas J. Bowen
John S. Allen	William R. Boyens
John H. Alvey	James A. Bradley, Jr.
Arthur E. Anderson	Richard T. Braun, Jr.
Gustav N. Anderson	Robert W. J. Brett
Stephen P. Anderson	George W. Brewster
Thomas E. Anderson	Roland T. Briere, Jr.
Thomas F. Anderson	Kenneth D. Brooks
Kenneth C. Antony	Phillip W. Brooks
Peter A. Appeddu	Harold R. Brown
Henry C. Atwood, Jr.	Kenneth C. Bruley
John J. Archer	Dean T. Buckingham
Donald L. Arney	Bayne R. Bunce
Coy H. Arnold II	William E. Burke
Lawrence P. Ash	William S. Butler
Hugo L. Auleb	Lewis H. Busell
Billy J. Avery	Lester J. Bushue
William McF. Bailey	Richard E. Buzbee
Ralph V. Bain	Don M. Bylund
Samuel M. Baker, Jr.	Paul R. Cain
David E. Barkkarie	Haven P. Cammett
James D. Barlow	Clayton G. Carlile
Michael McC. Barrett	James C. Carlson
Norman D. Bartlett, Jr.	Gerald R. Carlstein
William McG. Bartlett	Louis F. Carson, Jr.
Furman W. Barton	Robert F. Carr III
Robert H. Baxter III	Neil A. Case
Charles W. Beck II	Frank L. Cason, Jr.
Robert L. Bedore	Frederick F. Censky
Harold S. Beers, Jr.	Jerrold E. Chappelaine
Anthony D. Belkofer, Jr.	Leslie F. Chesson
Paul M. Benadik	Guion C. Childress
"J" Gilbert Benedict	James N. Clay
Frank S. Bennett	Louis Colbus
Francis N. Berdanier	Bennett O. Cole
William H. Bernard	Wade H. Coleman III
Andrew Blache, Jr.	William D. Collins
John L. Billetter	John G. Colson, Jr.
Bert W. Bishop	Henry W. Conner
Henry C. Black II	Glenn T. Conrad, Jr.
Willard C. Blackney, Jr.	Paul B. Conway
Norman G. Block	Russell A. Cook
Gerald A. Bodden, Jr.	Charles H. Cooley
Maurice J. Boenitz	Robert J. Corboy
Frank N. Boensch, Jr.	Russell S. Cowell
	James C. Coyne
	James L. Cranwell, Jr.

Render Crayton	William H. Guengerich	Edward Kratochvil	Thomas A. O'Halloran, Jr.	Milford E. Shirley	Wayne E. Thudium
John F. Criss	Allan B. Gurney	John P. Kricciunas	John J. O'Hara	John A. Shurtleff	William Y. Tighe
Harry E. Crosson	Gunter Hagen	Robert G. Lacy	Charles H. Oliver	David H. Simon	Gordon E. Tinker
James G. Cullen	Wilfred J. Hahn	Donald P. Landfried	Harold W. Olson, Jr.	William L. Simon	Charles S. Tolbert
Elton C. Curran	Charles F. Hall	William R. Lavalley	David N. Orth	Lawrence F. Slawson	John W. Tombarge
Robert A. Curran	Robert H. Hall	Ronald F. Lehr	Heber B. Osborne, Jr.	William H. Small, Jr.	Lyman P. Townsend
Fred M. Curtis	Walter Halperin	Nathan St. C. Lemacks	Robert J. O'Shaughnessy	Edward R. Smith	Harold L. Turner
Robert E. Curtis	William M. Hames, Jr.	John D. Leonard, Jr.	Albert Ottaviani	John C. Smith	William E. Turner, Jr.
Robert W. Dacus	Richard N. Hamilton	John R. Levandosky	Roger D. Painter	Kenneth J. Smith	William H. Turner
Joseph J. Daigneault, Jr.	Marvin F. Hanigan	Herman Levin	Wilbur L. Palmer	Maurice R. Smith	Donald F. Urban
Bruce C. Dale	James F. Hannagan	Jeremy I. Levin	Alex W. Panas	Nathan H. Smith	San Utsunomiya
James M. Daly II	Warren E. Hanson	Norman R. Levins	Richard G. Parise	Robert W. Smith	John H. VanDeventer, III
James G. Davis	Frederick D. Harper	Adam E. Lewert	Eldon E. Park	Peter B. Snook	Jesse S. VanOver, Jr.
James B. Deane, Jr.	Robert P. Harper, Jr.	Robert S. Lewis	Kenneth B. Parker, Jr.	Richard W. Snyder	John D. Varnes
Edward D. Devine III	George H. Harvey	Lloyd A. Liatti	William DeL. Parker	Frank D. Sorenson	George J. Vellella
James H. DeVries	Ronald A. Hasse	Eugene F. Lilly	Thomas A. Parnell	William C. Souleret	John R. Vennerholm
Ronald P. DeWalt	Charles W. Hawkins	William M. Linden	Allan G. Paulson	Gabriel P. Sparagana	John J. Viera, Jr.
Ray B. Diamond	Robert H. Hayes	Thomas L. Lindsay	Kenneth L. Penegar	Paul E. Speirer, Jr.	Henry F. Villaume
John M. Dick	Harry Hazlehurst III	Robert G. Littleston	Ladislav J. Perenyi	Arthur R. Sprague, Jr.	James T. Waddill III
Charles E. Dickenson, Jr.	William P. Helfrich	Robert B. Livingston	Ralph J. Perrotta	William W. Spurrer	Mercer A. Wade
Edmond J. Dilworth, Jr.	Donald K. Helgeson	Frank J. Lord	Eugene C. Perry, Jr.	Ronald A. Stark	John A. Wallace
Philip M. Doell	Robert E. Helton	Carl K. Lunde	John H. Phillips	Larry W. Starr	Gary L. Walters
Louis J. Dolan, Jr.	Tom L. Henry	Jerrold I. Lupoff	Raymond C. Phillips	John C. Staton	Ted C. Steele, Jr.
James R. Dombey	Phillip C. Herren	Noel R. Lykins	Joseph V. Pikell	Earl S. Steeves, Jr.	Anthony W. Wardell
Alfred Donati, Jr.	Thomas C. Herren	Jack D. McAllister	Hal W. Pilgrim	Anthony Steimle	John D. Waugh
Daniel E. Donovan	Carl F. Herring, Jr.	William R. McClure	John D. Pine	Henry L. Stein	Robert H. Weaver
Donald J. Douglass	Walter T. Herrmann	Howard M. McCormack	Rodger E. Pitstick	George F. Steiner	George E. Weinhold
Donald S. Dowden	Charles A. Herubin	William A. McGown, Jr.	Donald F. Pitt	James Steiner	Allan T. Welcome
Charlie P. DuBose	James R. Hessian	Roy E. McLaughlin	John P. Pittman, Jr.	Herbert H. Steinman	Howard A. Weltner
Edwin C. Duerr	Merlyn R. Heusinkveld	Paul McMaster	William L. Plumb	Sydney V. Stern	Linus E. Wensman
Richard F. Dugan, Jr.	Edward J. Hickey, Jr.	Thomas McMillan, Jr.	Jack R. Polakowski	Edward C. Stevenson	James E. Wessel
Stephen F. Durocher	Robert H. Higgs	Larry L. McMullen	William V. Polleys III	LeeRoy J. Stevenson	Wesley W. Wetzel
Henry W. Dwyer	Reginald B. Hilborn, Jr.	James M. McSherry	Neal R. Popham	Charles H. Stilwell, Jr.	John F. Whealy
Cromwell A. Dyer, Jr.	Ian T. Hill	William A. J. MacLeod	Jerome Post	John Q. Stilwell	Irvin L. White
Edgar A. Earnhart	Roger W. Hill	William J. Mann	Francis S. Pramuk	DeLeon E. Stokes	Aldean W. Whitton, Jr.
Otto P. Eberlein	William H. Holden, Jr.	Allan W. Markham	Ralph J. Pugliano	James G. Stuart, Jr.	Thomas J. Whyte
William R. Eels, Jr.	James T. Holland, Jr.	Dennis G. Marks	Joseph M. Purtell	Campbell L. Stubbs, II	Harlan H. Wiederspan
Richard L. Ehr	Roy C. Holland	John A. Marks	George J. Rabstajnek, Jr.	John B. Sullivan	Thomas W. Williams
Theodore F. Elbert III	Stephen F. Honan	Benjamin G. Martin, Jr.	Gilbert E. Raines	Henry N. Sutherland	David G. Wilson
Eugene D. Ellis	Harold S. Hook	Christopher D. Martin	Augustus G. Randolph	John C. Sweeney	James C. Wilson, Jr.
David A. Engels	Thomas M. Hopper	Howard V. Martin	William S. Rauber	John H. Sweeney	John R. Winkowski
David W. Eppink	Roy W. Hosking	James F. Martin	Hilary J. Rauch	Paul A. Tanksley	George C. Winn
Reuben E. Erickson	James M. Hoskins	Roger J. Martineau	Robert F. Raymond	Robert B. Tarkington	Richard T. Wise
Ronald C. Esper	Gale K. Hovey	Thomas J. Marx	Richard A. Reed	James D. Taylor	Fred J. Withers
Franklin J. Eubank	Lawrence K. Howard	Roger A. Massey, Jr.	Alex D. Reeves, Jr.	Robert I. Taylor	Gerard S. Witucki
Robert J. Evans	David A. Howells	John D. Matthews	Marvin O. Register	Charles F. Tepe	Ermin S. Wojcik
Thomas H. Ewall	Eugene W. Howley	Charles B. Maurer	Rust E. Reid	Jack E. Thomas	Frederic C. Wood, Jr.
Charles R. Fagg	Paul L. Hryskanich	James H. Mayer	Frank J. Reilly, Jr.	Loel E. Thompson	Rockford G. Yapp, Jr.
Archie B. Fairley, Jr.	Robert N. Hubbell	Francis X. Meaney	Duane C. Remsnyder	Reuben T. Thornton	Richard G. Yost
Warren E. Farwell	Francis R. Huch	John A. Mehr	Donald K. Rice	III	Ronald R. Zuilkoski
Alfred T. Faul	Robert P. Hukill	Noel Melville	Statton L. Rice II		
Matthew W. Fegan, Jr.	George A. Hume	Robert G. Merkle	John C. Richardson		
Allan G. Feldt	Fred R. Huston	William Miglas	Jerry M. Rippel		
Arthur R. Fitzgerald	Thomas C. Hutchinson, III	David H. Miller	Charles M. Ritchie		
Neil T. Fitzmorris	Robert L. Ilaria	Glenn "J" Miller	John Ritchie IV		
Thomas B. Fleming	John S. Inman	Guy F. Miller	John B. Rivers		
Robert B. Fraser	James A. Janousek	Robert R. Miller	Hugh A. Roberts		
Donald G. Friedl	Leonard J. Janowski	Robert P. Milne	George A. Robinson, Jr.		
David T. Friest	James E. Jobe	Donald E. Mintz	Glenn A. Rodehorst		
Thomas A. W. Frye	Charles R. Johnson	Marvin W. Mirsch	Charles O. Rodas		
Glenn F. Fuhrman	George P. Johnson	Robert B. Montgomery	James R. Roesser		
Vaughn D. Fuller	Kenneth L. Johnson	Seymour P. Montgomery	Philip C. Ropp		
Edwin R. Gabler	Lawrence J. Jonaus	Charles E. Moore	Lawrence J. Rose		
James J. Gainor	John A. Jones	Charles M. Moran, Jr.	Charles M. Rowland, Jr.		
Albert A. Gallotta	George J. Jonovich	Frank A. Morgan III	Joe F. Rufner		
Donald P. Gatley	Dale E. Jurgensen	Robert H. Morrow	John R. Russell		
Fred W. Gatter, Jr.	Dale E. Kaiser	Robert A. Morse	Kenneth B. Russell		
John W. Gaul	George T. Karabatsos	Theodore E. Morton	John L. Ruth		
Robert E. Gearhart	Richard J. Kastenholz	Jack L. Moss	Paul Sadler		
James C. Geoghegan	Robert H. Kaufman	John H. Mulligan	Gerald Sakats		
William I. George	John S. Keating, Jr.	Arthur D. Murphy	Richard S. Salzman		
Gerald W. Gill	Jackson M. Keim	Daniel F. Murphy	Bertrand E. Sample		
Richard D. Gillham	Marc N. Kelley	Raymond L. Murphy, Jr.	Leon C. Schaller		
Sidney Gladstone	Alfred E. Kerby	Charles W. Murray, Jr.	James S. Schenck, III		
Charles R. Glassey	Kenneth L. Kiel	Philip F. Murray	Stephen Schmidt		
Charles T. Goodhue	Donald J. King	Bruce E. Murtha	Charles E. Schott		
Richard M. Goss	James E. King	Wayne A. Muth	David M. Schrader		
James W. Gotcher, Jr.	Robert B. King	Merice T. Nelles	Earl E. Schuitz		
Duncan Grant	Donald E. Klein	Wallace S. Nelowet	Paul F. Schutt, Jr.		
Robert T. Greathead	John F. Kneisl	Daniel A. Neuhauser	William K. Scott		
Neal Gresham	George L. Knister	Henry V. Nietzsche	William A. Selby		
John J. Griffin, Jr.	Dale A. Knutson	Rees E. Noren	James Q. Selsor		
Edgar L. Griffith	William J. Kockelman	Rudy R. Norris	Thomas A. Shannon		
Fred B. Griswold	Kenneth W. Koeritz	Edward C. Nott, Jr.	Charles P. Shaw, Jr.		
Robert H. Grose	Donald L. Korn	Daniel H. O'Brien	Scott A. Shaw		
Edward B. Gross	David J. Krall	Kenneth A. O'Brien	William M. Shewchuk		
Melvin "J" Grossgold	Frank A. Kramer		Charles E. Shinholser		
Harry E. Guida					

The following-named (Naval R. O. T. C.) to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Richard L. Allison	Robert E. Laster
Richard J. Anderson	Stimson S. T. Lee
John D. P. Arnold, Jr.	Joseph M. Murray
Robert S. Burd	Jerome M. O'Sullivan
Howard O. Casada	Kenneth A. Rash
Michael J. Connor	Peter E. Schmitt
Joseph M. Cowden, Jr.	Charles W. Schreiner,
George H. Eastman	Jr.
Patrick K. Gallagher	Roland E. Smith
William J. Griffin	Noel W. Spencer, Jr.
Robert O. Hale	Thomas M. Walsh III
Milton A. Hatfield	Joseph R. Wester
James M. Ingram	Clifton C. Williams, Jr.

The following-named (A. R. O. T. C.) to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

John W. Brown	Harold G. Golla, Jr.
James C. Byrd	Francis W. Gorham, Jr.
John S. Daniel, Jr.	Phillip W. Ireland
John E. Fitzgerald, Jr.	William F. Kendig
Leo A. Gildersleeve	

The following-named (civilian college graduates) to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Morton I. Baum	Leo G. Mathieu
Walter H. Davis	Carl B. Olsen, Jr.
Glen A. Claybourn	James C. Page
James D. DeLoach	Augustus J. Pesce
William M. Hickey, Jr.	John R. Yates, Jr.
John B. Hotis	Charles L. Zangas
Robert C. Jones	

The following-named officers to the grade indicated in the Medical Corps in the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

- Lieutenant*  
 Jerry J. Zarriello  
*Lieutenant (junior grade)*  
 Rolland E. Greenburg  
 Joseph L. Schwartz, Jr.

The following-named officers to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Dental Corps in the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

- Phillip V. D. Reitz, Jr.  
 Robert W. Slater  
 Maury E. Wortham

The following-named Reserve officers to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

- |                   |                      |
|-------------------|----------------------|
| George S. Ames    | Frederick S. Johnson |
| Martin A. Craig   | Maurice L. Murphy    |
| John E. Duck      | George E. Otott      |
| James W. Fritziem | Walter J. Rudicus    |
| Luther E. Gartin  | Frederick N. VanSant |
| David H. Hawkins  |                      |

The following-named officers of the Navy for permanent promotion to the grade of lieutenant (junior grade) in the line and staff corps indicated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

LINE

- |                         |                      |
|-------------------------|----------------------|
| Robert J. Anderson      | Harry B. Knecht      |
| Donald L. Angier        | Ethelyn M. Koch      |
| James J. Arnold         | Catherine Lintott    |
| James H. Ayres          | Elizabeth A. Maloney |
| Veronica E. Baker       | Robert C. Mason      |
| Phillip A. Barnes       | John A. Mazzolini    |
| Roy F. Barrett          | David J. McNulty     |
| Russell B. Bridgham     | Joseph J. McBeth     |
| Albert N. Chandler, Jr. | Albert S. McLemore   |
| Howard Chereskin        | Joe C. Mitchell      |
| Raymond B. Corob        | Donald C. Pette      |
| Everett D. Corsepius    | Jean R. Pouliot      |
| Harold E. Dame          | Maurice W. Rea       |
| Wilfrid Devine          | Eugene C. Rueff      |
| Richard A. Dickins      | Jesse E. Sampson     |
| John C. Duck            | Maureen M. Sheehan   |
| Robert F. Dussault      | John K. Skomp        |
| Eric N. Fenno           | Sherwin J. Sleeper   |
| James R. Floyd          | Theodore Miguel, Jr. |
| Arthur D. Fowler, Jr.   | Leonard J. Sobieski  |
| Jack T. French          | George A. Sorg       |
| John E. Gardner, Jr.    | Robert L. Thomas     |
| Harry R. Graf           | Robert L. Thompson   |
| Thomas D. Hall          | Faris A. Tomlinson   |
| Vinto O. Harkness, Jr.  | Floyd P. West        |
| Miriam M. Harris        | Howard W. Wilkins    |
| Robert R. Harvey, Jr.   |                      |

SUPPLY CORPS

- |                   |                   |
|-------------------|-------------------|
| John E. Bozewicz  | Charles B. Paul   |
| Paul M. Gralton   | James B. Ramey    |
| James E. Hammond  | Gerald M. Robison |
| Ivan J. Klatt     | William G. Vroman |
| Harold P. O'Neill |                   |

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

- Curtis R. Williams, Jr.

MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

- Louis R. Kaufman  
 John P. Quinn

NURSE CORPS

- Rebecca H. Jackson  
 Rose A. Kirsch

The following-named line officers of the Navy for permanent appointment in the Supply Corps, in the grades indicated:

*Lieutenant*

- Ferris L. French, Jr.

*Lieutenant (junior grade)*

- Melville I. MacQuarrie  
 Earl R. Short
- Dennis C. Stanfill  
 Arthur A. York

*Ensign*

- John G. Thweatt, Jr.  
 Edmund M. Waller, Jr.  
 Donald E. Neumann
- John A. Murphy  
 Jr. Raymond L. Paulson  
 Donald D. Burbank

- Frank C. Skiles, Jr.  
 Norman C. Thomas
- Forrest E. Firth  
 Joseph W. Jernigan

The following-named line officers of the Navy for permanent appointment in the Civil Engineer Corps with the grade of ensign:

- |                       |                             |
|-----------------------|-----------------------------|
| William H. Bannister  | Marshall N. Whitehurst, Jr. |
| Archer E. Church, Jr. | William M. Zobel            |
| Olin L. Dixon III     |                             |
| Robert M. Sutley      |                             |

The following-named line officers for permanent appointment in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy in the grade indicated:

*Lieutenant*

- Oran W. V. Young

*Lieutenant (junior grade)*

- Telofil D'Moch

The following-named women officers of the Navy for permanent promotion to the grade of lieutenant in the line and Supply Corps as indicated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

LINE

- |                        |                      |
|------------------------|----------------------|
| Margaret L. Boyce      | Sara J. Lloyd        |
| Helen A. Chrobak       | Vivian J. McLaughlin |
| Claire M. Clark        | Olive A. Meining     |
| Gloria M. Deignan      | Eleanor A. Ovitt     |
| Mary E. Donnelly       | Carolyn E. Russell   |
| Margaret M. Fitzgerald | Charlotte L. Safford |
| Leona J. Fox           | Dorothea H. Shinn    |
| Marjorie H. Kaff       | Catherine J. Thomas  |
| Mary J. Linderman      | Allyn R. Thompson    |

SUPPLY CORPS

- Lois E. Harden  
 Debbie B. Smith

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 27 (legislative day of April 14), 1954:

UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGES

Dal M. Lemmon, of California, to be United States circuit judge, ninth circuit (new position).

Richard Harvey Chambers, of Arizona, to be United States circuit judge, ninth circuit (new position).

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Lawrence Edward Walsh, of New York, to be United States district judge for the southern district of New York.

CIRCUIT COURTS, TERRITORY OF HAWAII

Frank Aloysius McKinley, of Hawaii, to be fourth judge, first circuit, circuit courts, Territory of Hawaii.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

William T. Plummer, of Alaska, to be United States attorney, division No. 3, district of Alaska.

POSTMASTERS

CALIFORNIA

- Harding, T. Crandell, Lafayette.

CONNECTICUT

- Louis E. Molinaro, North Grosvenor Dale.

ILLINOIS

- Robert A. Hummert, Breese.  
 Albert L. Immel, Carthage.  
 Kate Wilson, New Haven.  
 Charles R. Callaby, Saunemin.  
 Eva V. Freund, Spring Grove.

IOWA

- James M. Pomeroy, Dedham.  
 Orle L. Jones, Earlham.  
 Clair L. Bowers, Runnells.  
 Burtis M. Bush, Stacyville.

KENTUCKY

- William W. Peavynhouse, Mount Sterling.

MASSACHUSETTS

- Everett G. Reed, Bryantville.  
 Edgar A. Whitcomb II, West Boylston.

MICHIGAN

- Gerald Howard, Stevensville.

NEW JERSEY

- Irving Krieger, East Orange.

OHIO

- Percy H. Friend, Baltic.  
 Gaylor W. Shutt, Convoy.  
 Ernest Falb, Copley.  
 Walter E. Sindel, Delta.  
 Paul H. Marshall, Marshallville.  
 Girde B. Harrington, Peninsula.  
 Clair E. Olson, Stow.

OREGON

- Conrad Burbank, North Portland.

PENNSYLVANIA

- Gerald E. Rishel, Boalsburg.  
 Bernard J. Arnold, Brockport.  
 Fred J. Mills, Houtzdale.  
 Godfrey G. Drake, Milford.  
 Allen W. Reep, Petrolia.  
 Twila K. Scott, Seneca.  
 Frederick E. Zimmerman, Southampton.  
 Charlotte M. Chase, West Springfield.

UTAH

- James Austin Cope, Jr., Spanish Fork.

VERMONT

- William P. Cook, Underhill.  
 Charles A. O'Brien, White River Junction.  
 Leon E. Andrus, Wolcott.

WISCONSIN

- Carroll E. Conner, Elkhorn.  
 Archie L. Kirby, Humbird.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, APRIL 27, 1954

The House met at 12 o'clock noon. Colonel, the Reverend R. L. Clem, rector of St. John's Military School, Salina, Kans., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, through whose mighty power our liberties have been won, we beseech Thee to look with favor upon our land and people. Thou hast made us great among the nations of the earth, and we pray for the grace to understand the responsibilities we bear to our fellow men and to Thee. We pray for those to whom Thou hast committed the authority of government; that Thou wilt grant them gifts of wisdom and understanding, of counsel and strength; that, upholding what is right and following what is true, they may help fulfill Thy divine purpose for all mankind. In the name of Christ and for His sake we ask it. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

PUBLIC BUILDINGS ACT OF 1949

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 6342) to amend the Public Buildings Act of 1949 to authorize the Administrator of General Services to acquire title to real property and to provide for the construction of certain public buildings thereon by executing purchase contracts; to extend the authority of the Postmaster General to lease quarters for post office purposes; and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: MESSRS. DONDERO, ANGELL, MCGREGOR, FALLON, and TRIMBLE.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AND INDEPENDENT AGENCY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1955

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 516, Rept. No. 1547), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

*Resolved*, That during the consideration of the bill (H. R. 8873) making appropriations for the Department of Defense and related independent agency for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes, all points of order against the bill or any provisions contained therein are hereby waived.

PRESIDENT'S COMMITTEE ON EMPLOYMENT OF THE PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, our good friend Maj. Gen. Melvin J. Maas, who was for many years a Member of this body and who is now chairman of the President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped Week, has asked me to extend to all Members of the House and their families an invitation to attend an Exposition and Parade of Progress on Rehabilitation and Employment of the Physically Handicapped which the President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped is holding at the Departmental Auditorium on Constitution Avenue.

The affair is being jointly sponsored by the District Commissioners' committee, and I have been told that the exhibits and displays will present a graphic picture of the great advances that have been made in this field during the past quarter century. Many of the exhibits will show handicapped persons at work, demonstrating how they have overcome disabilities and returned to productive livelihood.

I hope that most of you will find an opportunity to attend the exposition as it will be not only revealing but highly stimulating. It will be open from noon until 5 p. m. and from 7 to 10 p. m. each of the 3 days, April 28, 29, and 30.

HON. DEWEY SHORT

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, there recently appeared in the Brookville American, of Brookville, Pa., an editorial which pleased me immensely concerning my very distinguished and able colleague, DEWEY SHORT. A great statesman and great American who, by his work in the Congress of the United States and as chairman of the Armed Services Committee, has won for himself the hearty commendations not alone of his colleagues but the people of the Nation as well.

NO TIME TO WASTE

Chairman DEWEY SHORT, of the House Armed Services Committee, tells us his group is informed that the Soviets now have 40,000 military aircraft, and that the Commies will reach their production peak this summer. This compares, he says, with 30,000 United States war planes, and that "we are still 3 years away from attainment of minimum goals."

When DEWEY SHORT speaks, the Congress listens, and the rest of us should, too. For the Galena, Mo., farm boy who began his working life behind a pair of jennies epitomizes the statesman that all of us would like to think is representing us in Washington. SHORT is one of the best-educated men in Congress. A graduate of 4 American colleges, he later studied at Berlin, Heidelberg, and Oxford Universities, and holds honorary degrees from 3 other American institutions. He was a Methodist minister and a professor of philosophy before entering politics. He has traveled every quarter of the globe, and few others in Congress have his grasp of world conditions. Yet he is intensely proud of his Ozark origin, and flavors his erudition with the salty realism of the mountain people from whom he sprang.

DEWEY SHORT has consecrated his public life to keeping America strong, and keeping Americans alert to the growing menace of communism. He tells us now "the U. S. S. R. has a fleet of at least 1,000 long-range bombers capable of delivering atomic bombs on the continental United States" and warns that "we must not delude ourselves that we can match the hordes of Russia and her satellites man for man, gun for gun, or even plane for plane."

"Quality of weapons," he assures us, "will always prevail against mere masses of men." To attain such dominance in the vital area of air defense, Representative SHORT says national air policy must recognize three points we have learned the hard way: First, research and development to insure superior aircraft designs. Second, an aircraft production level that will keep our forces 100-percent modern through the years. Third, long-term procurement at a rate adequate to support at least 1 year's war effort from existing production lines.

In adding our 2 cents' worth to the Congressman's views, we can only observe that Americans are not likely to win at the price tag on survival, yet it is worth noting that Mr. SHORT points out what bitter experience has taught, that long-term procurement (whether planes or ships or other weapons) costs far less than stop-and-start fever-chart production.

ARMS TO IRAQ AND NEAR EAST  
PEACE

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, the announcement the other day that our Government has introduced an explosive note in the already trouble-ridden situation in the Near East by its decision to give arms aid to Iraq is properly a matter of grave concern. This question was raised by 35 Members of Congress, 29 from both parties in this body and 6 from the other body in a letter of February 5, 1954, to the Secretary of State expressing grave concern over any such policy by our Government.

Iraq is a member of the Arab League and is still in a technical state of war with Israel, not having concluded even an armistice agreement as have other Arab states. The situation in the Near East, we all know, is at a critical point with boycotts, border incidents of daily occurrence, and incendiary statements by Arab leaders. It must be assumed that our Government seeks to justify this decision on grounds of the national security. Accordingly, in view of the seriousness of a decision to furnish arms to one of the Arab States our people should know the answers to the following questions, and I am requesting the answers from the State Department.

First. What are the commitments and capability, if any, undertaken by Iraq to support Turkey and Pakistan in their defense arrangements for the Middle East?

Second. What commitments, if any, have been undertaken by Iraq to refrain from using arms available to it for aggression, either itself or through other members of the Arab League?

Third. How does our Government believe arms available to Iraq will affect the three-power declaration of May 1950 to preserve the integrity of the borders of the countries of the Near East—declared by us, the United States, Great Britain, and France?

Fourth. What action is our Government prepared to take and is any parallel action called for by the other two governments concerned to see that the three-power declaration of May 1950 is respected?

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. ANGELL asked and was given permission to address the House for 20 minutes today, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on tomorrow, Calendar Wednesday, be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

## CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Obviously a quorum is not present.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 55].

Battle	Gubser	Powell
Boykin	Haley	Rabaut
Buchanan	Hand	Reed, Ill.
Buckley	Harrison, Nebr.	Regan
Budge	Hart	Richards
Camp	Herlong	Rivers
Carlyle	Holt	Roberts
Celler	Jackson	Roosevelt
Chatham	Jenkins	Saylor
Chelf	Kearney	Shafer
Clardy	Kee	Shelley
Condon	Kersten, Wis.	Sieminski
Cooley	King, Calif.	Sutton
Coudert	Landrum	Taylor
Crosser	Lantaff	Thompson,
Dawson, Ill.	McDonough	Mich.
Dingell	Magnuson	Walter
Dollinger	Martin, Iowa	Weichel
Donovan	Miller, Kans.	Wharton
Dorn, N. Y.	Miller, N. Y.	Wheeler
Doyle	Morrison	Widnall
Edmondson	Moss	Wilson, Calif.
Engle	Moulder	Wilson, Ind.
Fine	Murray	Wilson, Tex.
Fogarty	Norblad	Yorty
Gamble	O'Konski	
Gordon	Patman	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 354 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

## HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BENTLEY].

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, it seems a long time since I was last in the well of this House 8 weeks ago yesterday, and under somewhat different circumstances than the present. It seems almost as long a time as those 15 or 20 minutes that I spent over there on my back, waiting for outside medical assistance.

I have so much to be thankful for that it is hard to know where to start. But at this time and place it would only be appropriate to begin with a sincere expression of gratitude toward all of my colleagues in the House, as well as many of our friends in the other body, as well as many others whose duties are here on Capitol Hill. No man could have had more demonstrations of friendship, concern, and affection, in every conceivable manner that they could be shown, than I have received from my friends in the Congress of the United States.

I cannot omit from this gratitude a very great number of persons from the executive branch whose concern was likewise so manifest. My deep thanks especially go to the President and Mrs. Eisenhower for their friendly words and deeds in the midst of a busy schedule.

For the thousands of people in my own district, in my State of Michigan, and throughout this great country and abroad who offered their prayers and sent their good wishes, both friends and

strangers, I can only say that I am firmly convinced that such prayers and good wishes were the outstanding factor in my regaining health and strength. Speaking of prayer, I must pay especial tribute to the inspiring visits of our beloved Chaplain, Bernard Braskamp. When I was lying on the floor of the House the two men who pulled me through those critical minutes, with assistance of others, were Chaplain Braskamp and WALTER JUDD. I shall never forget either those few minutes or those two men.

I must remember to be thankful for my own good physical condition which helped me so much in my fight for life, and I cannot pay too high tribute to the doctors and nurses who attended me at Casualty Hospital. The chief of staff, Dr. Joseph Rogers Young, never left the hospital for the first 5 days and nights I was there. He and his wonderful associates are another reason I am here today.

This has been the barest of summaries of the bounds of my gratitude. With the help of my wonderful wife, who stood this ordeal so bravely and who never ceased to give me courage by her own example, I am trying to express my thanks personally in as many instances as it is possible for me to do. Given a little more time, I hope to complete that pleasant task.

A word about those responsible for this incident. I certainly hold nothing in my heart but pity and sympathy for the poor wretches whose bullets laid me and my four colleagues low. For those who directed and guided their mission, be they Nationalist or Communist, I have no rancor but on them lies the true guilt for what happened here 8 weeks ago yesterday.

None of us, I know, in the slightest degree holds the people of Puerto Rico responsible for that tragic occurrence. But I think it would be blind stupidity to pretend that a Puerto Rican problem does not exist, a problem greater on the mainland than on the island. I do not want to go into that problem at this time, Mr. Speaker, but I do ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and to include extraneous material at this point in the RECORD.

I have had a good deal of time for thinking and reflecting during the past 8 weeks. Until my own end, I presume I will never be closer to death than I was then. My life hung in the balance, I was literally in the hands of the Lord. There were many things that brought me back from the grave, my own young and strong heart, the care and attention that I received, the prayers and good wishes everywhere. In fact, I consider myself a living example of what prayer can do if it is sincere enough. But there is something which transcends all these.

God did not intend for me to die then. It was His will that all of our lives be spared that bloody day. But it was also with His will that the shooting did take place and I can only humbly guess that it is His desire that some lesson be drawn from that incident. If we were spared it must have been with some purpose in mind.

Each of us is free to draw whatever lesson he or she desires. But I know

that a rewarding experience for me has been to rediscover the inherent good and great nature of the American people. Not as Democrats or Republicans but as good and loyal citizens of this country, the American people were shocked and horrified by this attack upon their lawmakers. Their response was in the clearest sense nonpartisan.

Mr. Speaker, it might be well for some of us in an election year to give some thought to our similarities rather than our differences. Both sides of the aisle suffered casualties and both sides of the aisle reacted in the same way. Political campaigns are good and proper in their place but we here in Washington have national and international problems whose importance far surpass the exigencies of any political contest. When we in Congress faced a terrible problem 8 weeks ago yesterday it was met with no thought of party lines. Perhaps the good Lord wanted to see if we could still meet problems on a nonpartisan basis. Perhaps it would be well if we met some of our bigger problems in the same way.

Mr. Speaker, one final word in closing. When I was carried out of here on March 1, I never had the slightest doubt that I would return to stand again with you. I felt that there were still too many things undone as far as I was concerned. And I do not believe that there is anyone in this body who should not feel that the future lies ahead of him. A young body does not have to have the monopoly of a young heart. With the help of Almighty God, let us then with remembrance of the past, look to the future and so conduct ourselves in the present that we may be worthy representatives of the American people, the greatest people the history of the world has ever known.

Mr. Speaker, I include an article from a New York newspaper and an editorial translated from *El Mundo*, San Juan, Puerto Rico:

WASHINGTON, April 11.—Congressman ALVIN M. BENTLEY, Republican, of Michigan, predicted today that attempts will be made to limit Puerto Rican immigration to the United States if the problems that it creates are not resolved at the local level.

BENTLEY was one of the five Members of the House of Representatives wounded last March 1, during the shooting that fanatical Puerto Rican Nationalists conducted in the Chamber of the House.

Emphasizing that he has no hatred for the people of Puerto Rico, BENTLEY told a reporter that "the wave of immigrants from the free commonwealth is creating problems" in the American cities that receive them. The largest Puerto Rican colony in the United States is in New York.

The Congressman said that "the local governments and the Puerto Ricans themselves who are already established in this country should assume part of the responsibility for the immigrants."

He added that he hopes that the Governor of Puerto Rico, Luis Muñoz-Marín, "will make new attempts to bring back to the island a number of those immigrants who are unprepared to adapt themselves to the American way of life."

BENTLEY said that Puerto Rico should make some effort so that Puerto Ricans who come to the United States are prepared for the transition.

"I do not believe in controlled migration," said BENTLEY, "but I believe that unless some of the responsibility is assumed locally, either

the Federal Government or the State governments will try to control Puerto Rican migration." The Republican legislator declared that if Puerto Rico wants its independence from the United States, "it can have it tomorrow as far as I am concerned." He added "and if they want statehood they should take their place behind Hawaii."

Referring to the fact that the free commonwealth does not pay Federal taxes, Congressman BENTLEY said that "the Puerto Ricans are getting a good deal without assuming the obligations of citizenship."

"Personally, I would prefer that Puerto Rico be an independent republic or a State of the Union."

[From *El Mundo*, San Juan, Puerto Rico, of April 14, 1954]

[Translation]

#### THE SPLENDORS OF DIGNITY

Representative ALVIN M. BENTLEY's recent words are an invitation to thought addressed to all Puerto Ricans. They are words to be read, reread, and pondered over.

And, before commenting on those words, we must say that Mr. BENTLEY is a man who has given evidence of spiritual greatness. He gave our people one of the greatest tokens of consideration and friendship. After shedding his blood due to serious wounds inflicted on him by Puerto Rican Nationalists, after hovering for several days between life and death because of these wounds, Mr. BENTLEY has at no time had words of vengeance or hatred for Puerto Rico or for his attackers. To the contrary, he has demonstrated, and is demonstrating, that he is seriously preoccupied with the future of the Puerto Rican people.

Therefore, we must heed his words, not as though dictated by ill will, which they are not, but as though pronounced by a friend who is interested in the solution of our problems in a manner most favorable for our country.

If we believed that Mr. BENTLEY was prejudiced, we would get out of this trouble as we did in the case of other Congressmen when, in their talks about Puerto Rico, they let themselves be guided by prejudice, inadequate information, or mistaken evaluation [of the situation].

But that is not the case now.

Representative BENTLEY made an announcement, presented a word of caution, and gave us certain advice. And those three were inspired by his desire to have our people value their citizenship highly and to assure them of a more stable future.

Mr. BENTLEY's announcement refers to the ideas already existing in the Nation as well as in some of the States with regard to controlling Puerto Rican immigration in some form or other. Our friend, the Congressman, who does not believe in this control, has announced his growing concern and asks that efforts be made to have the immigrant prepared as well as possible so that he will adapt himself to and develop in his new surroundings.

This is exactly what we have been suggesting in these columns. If we wish to make use of American citizenship in order to freely live and work on United States territory, the least we can do is show appreciation of [respect for] that citizenship. It is a horrible inconsistency that some Puerto Ricans use their American citizenship to live and work in the United States while ardently devoting themselves to stirring up hatred and prejudice against the Americans.

On the other side, the immigrant, if he is a responsible person, must seek to create as few problems as possible in the locations to which he goes. And his first indication of good faith must be an effort on his part to learn the native language of his new home.

The Puerto Rican immigrant who learns English proves that he appreciates his American citizenship, and that he wants to identify himself with the community which receives him and gives him a chance to make a living. It is good citizenship and quite natural. Not wanting to learn English demonstrates stupidity and irresponsibility.

Mr. BENTLEY's word of caution refers to our form of government. According to him, we are enjoying the gift of economic advantages and of such advantages as are offered by citizenship, without assuming all of its responsibilities. We contribute nothing to the Federal Government, to which every American citizen should be happy to contribute his share. Representative BENTLEY, furthermore, indicates that he expects growing dissatisfaction in Washington over the convention signed in 1952.

The dissatisfaction will not only be in Washington but also in Puerto Rico. There are a great many Puerto Ricans who are not satisfied with appearing to be in an advantageous situation, gambling with local independence by using Federal funds, while retaining American citizenship not because of love, identification, or desire, but because it is one of many conveniences.

This hideous picture is not the picture Puerto Rico should present in national and international affairs.

If Puerto Rico wants her independence, the United States will give it to her. That is what President Eisenhower said. That is what the United States Congress said via the lips of many of its Members such as Mr. BENTLEY. They repeat it to us at every turn.

And if Puerto Rico does not want independence, as the Puerto Rican Chambers [Houses of Congress] are avowing, the only truly dignified and serious course is to respect and desire American citizenship and make an effort to grow with it [aspiring for] the only growth which everybody understands perfectly, which is the growth into statehood.

Mr. BENTLEY is presenting the pattern: Wait, take your turn after Hawaii, as Hawaii has done for so many years.

The Congressman has every reason for his word of caution which makes us blush. In American citizenship we cannot be equals of our fellow citizens, nor can we expect that they regard us as such, if we do not accept and respect this citizenship with all its implications, with all its consequences.

On the other side, we cannot fit into a pattern of self-respect by enjoying a citizenship for which we are not willing to go the limit.

To be sure, Puerto Rico is today in no condition to weight down its people with the burdens of statehood. But it [Puerto Rico] could be, in the near or distant future, according to how the economic development proceeds. Meanwhile, there is great need for a fixed and clear goal, a coherent [straight-line] orientation.

It is not necessary to assume statehood responsibilities immediately. Neither will the Congress act immediately.

By demonstrating the desire to assume those responsibilities, by working toward achieving that status, by showing appreciation of and respect for our American citizenship, we can, without blushing, accept whatever advantages that citizenship will give us and we can speak, in behalf of it, with our heads held high, anywhere—here, in the United States, in foreign countries.

The advice given us by Mr. BENTLEY is that we choose between statehood and independence—in either case, as people who want to be masters of their own destiny and are willing to assume full responsibility.

These are the splendors of dignity.

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

#### THE LATE SAMUEL DICKSTEIN

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I sorrowfully take the floor at this time to announce to the House the death of a former colleague of ours, the Honorable Samuel Dickstein, who served in this body for 23 years and who was my predecessor from the 19th District of New York.

I am certain that those Members who served with him will remember Sam Dickstein. They will recall that he, with the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], was cochairman of one of the first Committees on Un-American Activities formed in this House. Those Members who remember his work will join with me in agreeing that he did an outstanding job in the investigation of un-American activities. He was one of the first to recognize, as most of us do now, that the dangers to this country, and to the democratic way of life as we enjoy it here, come not only from the left, from the Communist conspiracy, but from the extreme right, from fascism, as well. He was one of the first to call the attention of this House to the dangers of Hitlerism and nazism, and the fact that Hitler was bent on war, as was subsequently borne out.

Sam Dickstein was born in 1885 near Vilna, Russia, and was brought to this country as a young boy and went to the public and high schools and law school in the city of New York. He was admitted to the bar in 1908.

He served as special deputy attorney general of the State of New York from 1911 to 1914. He was a member of the New York City Board of Aldermen in 1917, from part of the district which I now represent. He was a member of the New York State Assembly from 1919 to 1922.

In 1922 he was elected to the 68th Congress and served here until the 79th Congress, when he resigned after having been elected to the supreme court of the State of New York. He served there with great distinction for the past 8 years, and brought great honor and credit to his family, his friends, and the Members of this House. During his service in the House he rose to the position of chairman of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. In that position he was responsible for liberalizing our immigration laws despite great opposition here on the floor, so that those who were compelled to flee from foreign lands, seeking our sanctuary in this country were enabled to do so.

Mr. Speaker, I am certain the Members will want to join me in extending to his family, his bereaved wife Essie, his

lovely young daughter, and his brothers and sisters, our condolences, our sympathy, and our fond prayer that the Lord may shine his countenance upon them in the future.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KLEIN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply grieved in the death a few days ago of our former colleague, and my personal friend, Samuel Dickstein, of New York.

Sam Dickstein had been a Member of this body when I arrived here as a new Member in December of 1928. During the years we served together until he was elected as a justice of the State Supreme Court of New York, and in the years that followed until his death, we were close personal friends.

I admired Sam Dickstein very much. He was a man of deep religious faith. He had an intense love for our country and its ideals and its institutions.

During his long term of service in this body, covering about 23 years, from 1922 until 1945, my late friend was one of the hardest working Members of the House of Representatives. He was a contributor to and a builder of progress. He was one of this body's most active Members.

One of the finest attributes any person can possess is loyalty. Sam Dickstein abundantly possessed this noble attribute; loyalty to God; loyalty to country; loyalty to friend, which he evidenced on so many occasions.

It also can safely be said of Sam Dickstein that, "He was a people's Congressman."

His life is another Horatio Alger story.

Our late colleague was born in Lithuania, coming to the United States with his parents when he was 6 years old. We can picture the difficult hurdles he had to overcome to educate himself and to progress to the high position he occupied during his life. Appreciating the opportunities offered to anyone to go ahead in our country, he took advantage of them, and with courage and determination he overcame obstacles that most persons would not want to meet. He made an outstanding name for himself.

While working as a young man, he obtained his education at the City College and later his training in law at the New York Law School, being admitted to practice of the law in 1908.

His first appearance in public life was in 1911 when he was appointed as a special attorney general of New York State.

In 1917 he was elected as a member of the board of aldermen, and in 1919 to the State legislature, serving until 1922. He was an active member of both bodies.

In 1922 Sam Dickstein was elected as a Member of this body in the Congress, serving until 1945, retiring from this body to assume the position of supreme court justice, to which he had been elected in the fall of 1945.

Sam Dickstein was one of the first persons in the United States who saw, over 20 years ago, the danger to this country, and to the world, of both communism

and nazism. I can see him now fearlessly making speeches in this body, warning his colleagues of those days, and our people of the vicious, destructive intentions of Hitler and nazism and of Stalin and communism.

There were only a few who, like Sam Dickstein, realized the coming danger of those world destructive movements. I was one of those few. In those days, Sam Dickstein and the few of us who agreed with him, were laughed and scoffed at—but not in later years, before and during World War II, in the case of nazism and fascism, and now in the case of the other devil—communism.

Sam Dickstein kept fighting in and out of the House, warning and awakening our people to the dangers of these two international conspiracies. He was truly one of the few pioneers in the awakening of America. If he had rendered no other service than this, America should be grateful to Sam Dickstein, for he was truly a great American.

As a result of his perseverance, this body reluctantly authorized the appointment, in 1934, of a Special Committee To Investigate Communism, Nazism, Fascism, and Bigotry. As I remember it, we were given \$30,000 to make this investigation. When I compare this amount with that which committees received in recent years, the work of that special committee can be viewed with the greatest of respect.

I was appointed chairman of that special committee, and Sam Dickstein was vice chairman.

We uncovered evidence showing that communism was an international conspiracy. We compelled Hitler to order the German bund in the United States to disband. We uncovered and broke up a Fascist plot among certain wealthy individuals to subvert our Government into that type of dictatorship.

We investigated and exposed the bigoted movements in our country, which evil-minded movements had strength in those days.

We recommended legislation, all of which became law.

In all of the investigations the special committee made, Sam Dickstein worked tirelessly, giving courageously of his ability and time in ferreting out, in obtaining evidence that could be received in a court of law; in exposing those subversive and un-American movements, and later in the passage through the Congress of the important measures recommended by the special committee.

I refer in some length to this part of the public service of my late friend, because the work of Sam Dickstein, prior to, during and after the investigation, constitutes one of the most important contributions ever made by any Member of the Congress in the history of our country.

His death having taken place, regretting it keenly as I do, I am happy to pay this simple tribute to Sam Dickstein—a great American and a valued friend.

I know that his fine life and outstanding public service will bring to his widow and her daughter great consolation and a softening of their great loss and sorrow.

To Mrs. Dickstein and her daughter, I extend my profound sympathy in their bereavement.

Mr. KLEIN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KLEIN. I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I, too, should like to join in paying tribute to and expressing my sympathy on the passing of our distinguished colleague whom I knew both before and during his and my service in the House of Representatives and since he was elected to the bench. He was a great man and a good man. He was a devoted and humane public servant. There will be few Sam Dickstein's to come from the city of New York, but we must take from his life the lesson and the resolve that America should always have a place for such men as Sam Dickstein. I, too, wish to extend to his wife and daughter my sincere sympathy.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KLEIN. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, Judge Dickstein was one of that famous breed of men who, coming out of our city slums, had a deeper sense of what they mean and, therefore, of the public duty which is required of those who are brought up in that way and come out successfully. The gentleman who is addressing the House and I both spent our early youth in this environment and know something about just what Judge Dickstein came from and what he meant as an American figure.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the House to give considered attention to the words of the gentleman from New York and to the words of the gentleman from Massachusetts, so that we can draw from Judge Dickstein's life and works the lesson that dangers to our freedom come from fanatics, both of the right and of the left, and that none of us should be taken in even now by the fanatics of the right who are now using our antipathy for the Communist totalitarians of the fanatic left for their private purposes of pushing their own brand of totalitarianism. I think Judge Dickstein, as he smiles upon us from above, would be deeply pleased if today that lesson could be drawn from his life and works.

I join with my colleagues in condolences and deepest sympathy to the family of Judge Samuel Dickstein.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KLEIN. I yield.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, it was my happy privilege to have known the late Honorable Samuel Dickstein for many years as lawyer, legislator, and judge. He was a hard-working humanitarian, who never ceased his efforts to improve the conditions of his fellow man. His was a lifetime of devotion to the best interests of his community, State, and Nation. He was a true public servant. Those who espouse the cause of immigration-quota systems in this country should bear in mind that if there had been such a quota system in effect when Sam Dickstein's parents brought him to this country, this country would

have lost the invaluable services of a very respected American citizen.

I join my colleagues in extending our profound sympathy to his widow and daughter.

Mr. KLEIN. I thank the gentleman. Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KLEIN. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MASON. I want to join with those who have spoken on this occasion. Sam Dickstein was my friend, and a close friend. I served with him on the Committee on Immigration for over 10 years. Part of that time he was chairman of the committee.

We had parallel interests. We were both immigrants. We both came from the old country, as it is called, when we were each 6 years of age. I was the 12th child in a family of 13, and I know something about what Sam Dickstein went through.

This country of ours provided the opportunity which Sam took advantage of, and which I have tried to take advantage of. So you might say that while Sam belonged to a different faith than I did, we had a "feller" feeling for each other. Each of us wanted to do what was best for this country that had provided us with an opportunity. I was Sam's right arm on many occasions when we held public hearings in several of the large cities of this country on the immigration problem. We thought alike on that problem.

So on this occasion I want to say that I am both surprised and shocked at his passing, because Sam was younger than I. I wish to extend my sympathy and deep consideration to his wife and his daughter on their loss of a kind husband and a considerate father. May Sam rest in peace. He has fought a good fight. He has kept the faith.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who desire to do so may extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, it is with sorrow that I learn of the demise of my life-long friend, Samuel Dickstein. We were both elected to the House of Representatives in 1922 to the 68th Congress. Not many of us are left of the group who came in in the 68th Congress. Only three remain: the distinguished Representative from Missouri, the Honorable CLARENCE CANNON, the distinguished Representative from New York, the Honorable JOHN TABER, and myself.

I distinctly remember the days when Sam Dickstein joined me in the early sessions of the 68th Congress. He was in his middle thirties, in the prime of life, enthusiastic, and raring to go. He soon became a member of the Committee on Immigration and finally achieved the chairmanship of that committee. He supported many liberal immigration bills and was ever the champion of the newly arrived. He knew that much of the strength of our Nation was drawn from our immigrants. He knew that we had achieved the highest standard of

living that civilization has ever known, and knew that this was because we had siphoned off the best of the brain and brawn of peoples everywhere. That thought was the lodestar he followed, and as a result many fine pieces of legislation bear the honored name of Dickstein.

Samuel Dickstein had been a vigorous prosecutor of the State of New York, a distinguished Congressman, and finally an eminent jurist. He had 1 more year to serve on the supreme court bench of the State of New York, before retirement. It is not given to many the opportunity to serve with such strength of character, honesty of purpose and integrity of action, as was the lot of Sam Dickstein.

Those of us who mourn him in death, loved him in life. As I pen these words, it seems as though in the early morning I see him in the distance, walking over the hill. He fondly waves goodby, and then is lost to vision. He has vanished into the great eternity.

It seems a bit sad that nature has struck him down and taken him unto her in the fullness of his powers. In his latter years he worked on many important cases. The opinions he wrote were replete with prudence, wisdom, and commonsense. His is a great loss to the judiciary, just as his departure from the legislative halls was a great loss to Congress.

His name will ever be revered in his home State of New York, and his name will be enshrined in our hearts here. Our condolences go forth to his lovely wife and dear ones.

He is gone but not forgotten. He lives in the hearts of his fellows, and that is not to die.

#### CONTINUATION OF OPERATIONS OF AMERICAN TIN SMELTER

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

Mr. SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced House Concurrent Resolution 226 which is a companion measure with that introduced yesterday in the other body by its distinguished minority leader, Senator JOHNSON of Texas. Attention of the House is invited to the speech appearing in yesterday's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on page 5461 by Senator JOHNSON. In the speech, he outlines the critical importance of continuing the operation of the smelter at Texas City. I shall not take up your time to repeat what the Senator said. However, it might be well to remind you that as we approach this problem, we should remember that however important the making of tin cans may be, there is another and a far more critical need for this mineral.

Tin is required in every machine which has moving parts. Nothing has yet been found to replace it for this purpose.

In an Associated Press dispatch dated Saturday, February 27, 1954, it was stated that the Secretary of the Navy

told a House committee of awarding a contract for three destroyers to be built at Quincy, Mass., for \$6½ million above the lowest bid in order to keep the yard in operation. I have no fault to find with this policy. Shipyards, with expert workmen readily available, are essential to the national defense.

I believe the same policy should be applied to the case of the Texas City tin smelter. It is not merely one of many similar facilities. It is the only one in this hemisphere, and it employs the only staff of technicians in the Americas. Once scattered, it would take longer to train new men than to rebuild the physical plant.

I am still very strongly of the opinion that the plant should be sold or leased on a long-term basis to private enterprise. I hope that the efforts of the executive department will be toward this end and that they will include, if necessary, a recommendation for a protective tariff.

I am hopeful that the House will take speedy action on this very important matter. Public Law 125 of the 80th Congress authorizes and directs the operation of the tin smelter until June 30, 1956, by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. Public Law 163 of the 83d Congress vests in the President these powers and authorizes him to delegate them to any appropriate Government department or agency. All that is needed at this time is a prompt expression to the executive department of congressional determination.

Under the present critical world conditions I believe it would be folly to close the only smelter in the Western Hemisphere. This concurrent resolution will direct its continuation for another year. I urge immediate and favorable action.

#### SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. BROYHILL asked and was given permission to address the House for 15 minutes on Thursday, April 29, following the legislative business of the day and any other special orders heretofore entered.

#### PUBLIC HEALTH GRANTS-IN-AID AMENDMENTS OF 1954

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 7397) to amend the Public Health Service Act to promote and assist in the extension and improvement of public health services, to provide for a more effective use of available Federal funds, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 7397, with Mr. GRAHAM in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose yesterday the Clerk had read section 1. If there be no amendment to this section the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. Section 314 of the Public Health Service Act is hereby amended to read as follows:

"GRANTS AND SERVICES TO STATES

"SEC. 314. (a) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year, beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, such sums for grants to carry out the purposes of this section as the Congress may determine. The sums so appropriated for any fiscal year shall be available for—

"(1) grants to States to assist them in meeting the costs of their public health services;

"(2) grants to States to assist them in initiating projects for the extension and improvement of their public health services; and

"(3) special project grants pursuant to subsection (d).

The portion of such sums which shall be available for each of such three types of grants shall be specified in the act appropriating such sums.

"(b) (1) From the sums available for any fiscal year for grants to States to assist them in meeting the costs of their public health services, each State shall be entitled to an allotment of an amount which bears the same ratio to such sums as the product of (A) the population of the State and (B) the square of its allotment percentage (as determined under subsection (i)) bears to the sum of the corresponding products for all the States. The allotment to any State under the preceding sentence for any fiscal year which is less than \$55,000 (or such other amount as may be specified as a minimum allotment in the act appropriating such sums for such year) shall be increased to that amount, the total of the increases thereby required being derived by proportionately reducing the allotments to each of the remaining States under the preceding sentence, but with such adjustments as may be necessary to prevent the allotment of any of such remaining States from being thereby reduced to less than that amount.

"(2) From each State's allotment under this subsection for any fiscal year, the Surgeon General shall pay to such State an amount equal to its Federal share (as determined under subsection (k)) of the cost of public health services under the plan or plans of such State, approved under subsection (f), including the cost of training of personnel for State and local health work and including the cost of administration of the State plan.

"(c) (1) From the sums available for any fiscal year for grants to States to assist them in initiating projects for the extension and improvement of their public health services, each State shall be entitled to an allotment of an amount bearing the same ratio to such sums as the population of such State bears to the population of all the States. The allotment to any State under the preceding sentence for a fiscal year which is less than \$25,000 (or such other amount as may be specified as a minimum allotment in the act appropriating such sums for such year) shall be increased to that amount, the total of the increases thereby required being derived by proportionately reducing the allotments to each of the remaining States under the preceding sentence, but with such adjustments as may be necessary to prevent the allotment of any of such remaining States from being thereby reduced to less than that amount.

"(2) From each State's allotment under this subsection for any fiscal year, the Surgeon General shall pay to such State a portion of the cost of approved projects for the extension and improvement of public health services (including their administration and the training of personnel for State and local health work) under the State plan or plans. The Surgeon General shall ap-

prove any project for purposes of this subsection only if the State plan (or one of the State plans) approved under subsection (f) includes such project or is modified to include it and only if he finds the project constitutes an extension or improvement of public health services under such State plan or will contribute materially to such an extension or improvement.

"(3) Payments under this subsection with respect to any project may be made for a period of not to exceed 6 years beginning with the commencement of the first fiscal year for which any payment is made with respect to such project from an allotment under this subsection. To the extent permitted by the State's allotment under this subsection, such payments with respect to any project shall be equal to 75 percent of the cost of such project for the first biennium in such period, 50 percent of such cost for the second biennium in such period, and 25 percent of such cost for the last biennium in such period; except that, at the request of the State, such payments may be less than such percentage of the cost of such project.

"(4) No payment may be made from an allotment under this subsection with respect to any cost with respect to which any payment is made under subsection (b) or (e).

"(d) (1) From the sums available therefor for any fiscal year, the Surgeon General shall (A) make grants to States and, with the approval of the appropriate State health or mental health authorities, to interstate agencies or to political subdivisions of States for paying part of the cost of public health services (including their administration) which are of importance to the solution of (i) emergency public health problems in specific geographical areas, or (ii) public health problems common to several States, or (iii) public health problems for which the Federal Government has a special responsibility, and (B) make grants to the extent authorized and in the manner provided by section 301 to State and local agencies, universities, laboratories, and other public or private agencies and institutions, and to individuals for such investigations, experiments, demonstrations, studies, and research projects in the field of public health as are recommended by the National Advisory Health Council.

"(2) Payments under this subsection may be made in advance or by way of reimbursement for services performed and purchases made, as may be determined by the Surgeon General; and shall be made on such conditions as the Surgeon General finds necessary to carry out the purposes of this subsection.

"(3) For the purposes of this subsection Guam shall be deemed to be a 'State'.

"(e) (1) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for each of the 3 succeeding fiscal years, in addition to the sums authorized to be appropriated pursuant to subsection (a), such sums as the Congress may determine for grants to States to assist them in meeting the costs of maintaining, and of extending and improving, their public health services in the field of mental health.

"(2) From the sums appropriated pursuant to paragraph (1) the Surgeon General, in accordance with regulations, shall from time to time make allotments to the several States on the basis of (A) the population, (B) the extent of the mental health problem, and (C) the financial need of the respective States.

"(3) From each State's allotment under this subsection for any fiscal year, the Surgeon General shall pay to such State an amount equal to its Federal share (as determined under subsection (k)) of the cost of public health services in the field of mental health under the plan of such State approved under subsection (f), including the cost of training of personnel for State and

local mental health work and including the cost of administration of so much of the State plan as relates to work in the field of mental health.

"(4) Nothing in this subsection shall in any way affect the availability of grants to the States under subsection (b) or (c) for work in the field of mental health.

"(5) No payment may be made from an allotment under this subsection with respect to any cost with respect to which any payment is made under subsection (b) or (c).

"(f) The Surgeon General shall approve any State plan which is submitted by the State health agency and which meets such requirements as the Surgeon General may prescribe by regulation. In the case of any State for which the State mental health authority is not the State health authority, a separate State plan shall be submitted by such mental health authority relating to work in the field of mental health; and the Surgeon General shall approve any such plan which meets such requirements as he may prescribe by regulation. No State plan submitted by a State health authority shall be approved unless it provides for the designation of a State advisory council which shall include representatives of nongovernment organizations or groups, and of State agencies, concerned with public health activities, including representatives of the public selected from among qualified persons familiar with the need for the various types of public health services in urban and rural areas, to consult with the State health authority in carrying out the State plan.

"(g) All regulations and amendments thereto with respect to grants to States under this section (other than grants under subsection (d)) shall be made after consultation with a conference of the State health authorities and, in the case of regulations or amendments which relate to or in any way affect such grants for work in the field of mental health, the State mental health authorities. Insofar as practicable, the Surgeon General shall obtain the agreement, prior to the issuance of any such regulations or amendments, of the State health authorities and, in the case of regulations or amendments which relate to or in any way affect such grants for work in the field of mental health, the State mental health authorities.

"(h) (1) Whenever the Surgeon General, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the State health authority (or, where appropriate, the State mental health authority) finds that—

"(A) the State plan submitted by such authority and approved under this section has been so changed that it no longer complies with a requirement prescribed by regulation as a condition of approval of the plan; or

"(B) in the administration of the plan there is a failure to comply substantially with such a requirement, the Surgeon General shall notify the State health authority (or, where appropriate, the mental health authority) that no further payments will be made to the State under subsection (b), (c), or (e) of this section (or in his discretion that further payments will not be made to the State for projects under or parts of the State plan affected by such failure) until he is satisfied that there will no longer be such failure. Until he is so satisfied the Surgeon General shall make no further payments to such State under subsection (b), (c), or (e) (or shall limit payments to projects under or parts of the State plan in which there is no such failure).

"(2) If any State is dissatisfied with the Surgeon General's action under this subsection, such State may appeal to the United States Court of Appeals for the circuit in which such State is located. The summons and notice of appeal may be served at any place in the United States. The Surgeon

General shall forthwith certify and file in the court the transcript of the proceedings and the record on which he based his action. The findings of fact by the Surgeon General, unless substantially contrary to the weight of the evidence, shall be conclusive; but the court, for good cause shown, may remand the case to the Surgeon General to take further evidence, and the Surgeon General may thereupon make new or modified findings of fact and may modify his previous action, and shall certify to the court the transcript and record of the further proceedings. Such new or modified findings of fact shall likewise be conclusive unless substantially contrary to the weight of the evidence. The court shall have jurisdiction to affirm the action of the Surgeon General or to set it aside, in whole or in part. The judgment of the court shall be subject to review by the Supreme Court of the United States upon certiorari or certification as provided in title 28, United States Code, section 1254.

"(1) The allotment percentage for any State shall be 100 percent less that percentage which bears the same ratio to 50 percent as the per capita income of such State bears to the per capita income of the continental United States (excluding Alaska), except that (A) the allotment percentage shall in no case be more than 75 percent or less than 33 $\frac{1}{3}$  percent, and (B) the allotment percentage for Hawaii shall be 50 percent, and the allotment percentage for Alaska, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands shall be 75 percent.

"(2) The allotment percentages shall be promulgated by the Surgeon General between July 1 and August 31 of each even-numbered year, on the basis of the average of the per capita incomes of the States and of the continental United States for the three most recent consecutive years for which satisfactory data are available from the Department of Commerce. Such promulgation shall be conclusive for each of the 2 fiscal years in the period beginning July 1 next succeeding such promulgation: *Provided*, That the allotment percentages promulgated by the Surgeon General pursuant to section 4 of the Public Health Grand-in-Aid Amendments of 1954 shall be conclusive for the 2 fiscal years ending June 30, 1957.

"(j) The population of the several States shall be determined on the basis of the latest figures furnished by the Department of Commerce.

"(k) The 'Federal share' for any State shall be equal to the State's allotment percentage, except that the Federal share for States with allotment percentages of more than 66 $\frac{2}{3}$  percent shall be 66 $\frac{2}{3}$  percent, and the Federal share for Alaska shall be 50 percent.

"(l) The method of computing and paying amounts pursuant to subsection (b), (c), or (e) shall be as follows:

"(1) The Surgeon General shall, prior to the beginning of each calendar quarter or other period prescribed by him, estimate the amount to be paid to each State under the provisions of such subsection for such period, such estimate to be based on such records of the State and information furnished by it, and such other investigation, as the Surgeon General may find necessary.

"(2) The Surgeon General shall pay to the State, from the allotment available therefor, the amount so estimated by him for any period, reduced or increased, as the case may be, by any sum (not previously adjusted under this paragraph) by which he finds that his estimate of the amount to be paid the State for any prior period under such subsection was greater or less than the amount which should have been paid to the State for such prior period under such subsection. Such payments shall be made prior to audit or settlement by the General Accounting Office and shall be made through

the disbursing facilities of the Treasury Department, and shall be made in such installments as the Surgeon General may determine.

"(3) The Surgeon General, at the request of the State health authority (or, in the case of mental health, of the State mental health authority) is authorized to reduce a payment to a State by the amount of the pay, allowances, traveling expenses, and other costs related to the detail of an officer or employee of the Public Health Service to the State, to one of its political subdivisions, or to a public or other nonprofit organization or agency in the State, when such detail is made for the convenience of and at the request of the State. The amount by which such payments are reduced for such purposes shall be available for the payment of such costs by the Surgeon General.

"(m) To assist further in the extension and improvement of public health services, the Surgeon General is authorized to train personnel for State and local health work, to detail personnel to Guam and American Samoa, and to extend training, investigation, demonstration, and consultative services to Guam, American Samoa, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

"(n) In accordance with regulations, any State may file with the Surgeon General a request that a specified portion of an allotment to it under subsection (b) or (c) be added to the corresponding allotment of another State for the purpose of meeting a portion of the cost of a particular and clearly defined public health service to be rendered by such other State, or a particular project for extension and improvement of public health services initiated by such other State. The Surgeon General shall grant the request of a State if he finds that to do so will further the purposes of this section."

SEC. 3. In order to afford the States which, immediately prior to July 1, 1955, were carrying on public health programs under State plans approved under section 314 of the Public Health Service Act (including plans for cancer control), reasonable opportunity to adjust the financing of their programs to the new allotment provisions of such section, as amended by this act, such provisions as applied to such States are hereby modified as follows: If the total of the allotments of any State (as computed under subsections (b) and (c) of section 314 of the Public Health Service Act as amended by this act) for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, would be less than 90 percent (or, in case the aggregate appropriations available for allotment under such subsections for such year are reduced below the aggregate appropriations which were available for allotments to the States for payments with respect to the cost of services (other than so much thereof as was available solely for allotments for work in the field of mental health) under approved State plans during the preceding year, less than 90 percent minus the percentage by which such appropriations are reduced) of the amount allotted to such State for payments with respect to the cost of services under its approved State plans during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955 (other than so much thereof as was allotted to such State for work in the field of mental health), such State's allotment under subsection (b) shall be increased to the extent such total is less than 90 percent (or 90 percent minus such percentage reduction in appropriations) of such amount. The Surgeon General shall in accordance with regulations (1) provide for reductions in the allotments of the remaining States under such subsections to the extent required to effect the increases provided in the preceding sentence, such reductions to be based on the extent to which the allotments of such remaining States are greater than 90 percent (or 90 percent minus any percentage reduction in appropriations) of their allotments for the

preceding year; and (2) provide for equivalent adjustments in the allotments of States under such subsections for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and any successive fiscal year in which any State's combined allotments under such subsections would otherwise be less than 90 percent (or 90 percent minus any percentage reduction in appropriations) of its allotments for the preceding year.

SEC. 4. This act shall become effective July 1, 1955; except that as soon as possible after the date of enactment of this act the Surgeon General shall promulgate allotment percentages in the manner provided in subsection (1) of section 314 of the Public Health Service Act, as amended by this act (and without regard to the date specified therein for such promulgation), such allotment percentages to be conclusive for the purposes of section 314 of such act for the 2 fiscal years ending June 30, 1957.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota (interrupting the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be considered as read, printed in full in the Record at this point, and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

(The Clerk concluded reading the bill.)

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Chairman, amendments to the Public Health Service Act proposed in this act are commendable for the local discretion it permits in administration.

It permits local and State health agencies to distribute Federal funds to areas and health groups having definite projects that are well supported and are especially adapted to local needs. It will discourage indiscriminate allocation of funds to projects doomed to failure because of lack of leadership and community enthusiasm.

The flexibility in fund allocation will permit State health administrators to place Federal help where special need is shown and where local agencies are sufficiently interested to provide matching funds, as well as civic support. In short, it will minimize waste of public funds and concentrate financial contributions to worthy projects.

As in all cases subject to discretionary ruling of administrators, the special project grants will return valuable public service in proportion to the care and judgment exercised by the administrator who will determine the relative benefits to the community in which such funds may be spent.

It is here that proper review and supervision by the State advisory health council can prevent unjustified expenditures on projects initiated by individuals or groups seeking special privileges.

Any authorization of funds in the field of mental health should be closely scrutinized. Any investment to aid in proper training of individuals can be of great good.

Training nurses, personnel workers, and psychologists is an important function of teaching institutions. Medical social workers who sincerely love their work can contribute greatly to restoring mentally disturbed individuals to their normal places in society.

The psychologist is especially well trained to discover through devious approaches the underlying factors responsible for temporary abnormal human reactions. But the physician, the family doctor, in whom individuals have learned to rely through years of relationship under many and varied conditions, is, after all, the one whose personal encouragement and timely advice can do most to prevent and correct the greatest number of cases of mental disturbances due solely to environmental conditions.

If this country had more general practitioners there would be correspondingly less need for legislation to train personnel for these special services.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. GRAHAM, chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 7397) to amend the Public Health Service Act to promote and assist in the extension and improvement of public-health services, to provide for a more effective use of available Federal funds, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 524, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### OUR FUTURE TRADE AND TARIFF PROGRAM

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I was honored with an invitation to participate in the sixth annual management conference on April 15, 1954, at my alma mater, Cornell University. The subject I was to discuss was Our Future Trade and Tariff Program.

Because of previous commitments, I was unable to attend. I prevailed upon my distinguished friend and colleague, the Honorable NOAH M. MASON, to go in my stead. In our midst Mr. MASON has proved himself to be an authoritative advocate of a sound tariff policy that would permit our Nation to join other nations of the world in fair competitive trade without abandoning our markets to goods produced by cheap foreign labor. In his speech at Cornell, my distinguished colleague from Illinois [Mr. MASON] lived up to his reputation

as an authority on tariff matters by making one of the most lucid, clear-thinking statements on the subject it has been my privilege to read. For the information of my colleagues, the Members of the House, I will at this point in the RECORD insert Mr. MASON's remarks:

#### WORLD TARIFFS AND TRADE

(Speech of Hon. N. M. MASON, Republican, of Illinois, at the Sixth Annual Management Conference, Cornell University, Thursday, April 15, 1954)

#### THE PROBLEM

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen of the conference, one of the greatest problems of our times is the problem of tariffs and trade, the flow of goods across national boundaries—and the obstacles to that flow. On excellent authority I make the flat statement that there are more obstacles today to the free flow of goods from one country to another than ever before in our history, during peace time.

To further complicate the problem is the fact that today the world is divided into two armed camps: One behind the Iron Curtain composed of 900 million people, dominated by Moscow, with state control of all foreign trade; the other armed camp consists of the so-called free nations—all nations outside the Iron Curtain—each with its own tariff barriers and trade restrictions, a veritable hodge-podge of tariff rates, ranging from the high average duty of 46.3 percent in Chile to the low average duty of 1.6 percent in Japan.

Besides the tariff restrictions of today, however, we have other obstacles to trade more complicated and more restrictive than any tariff rate, namely, multiple currencies, embargoes, import and export licenses, trade preferences, subsidies, state trading, etc. Tariff duties are the mildest form of our present-day trade restrictions; they constitute the old-fashioned method of restricting trade; they are not to be compared to the more modern and more efficient methods—such as quotas, licenses, multiple currencies, etc.

Dr. Clair Wilcox, one of the best posted men in America on problems of foreign trade, formerly Director of International Trade for the State Department, stated in a recent speech:

"The trade of the world today is more tightly regimented than it ever has been before in history, in time of peace."

#### THE HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF OUR PROBLEM

All wars have their repercussions: Social, financial, physical, and spiritual. One of the major repercussions of every war, a repercussion not usually discussed or considered, is the effect every war has upon world trade.

After World War I, Europe might be said to have become Balkanized. That is, the natural barriers to trade between the 23 European nations—such as mountain ranges, boundary lines, language obstacles, currency differences, etc.—were all accentuated as a result of the war by the imposition of many artificial trade barriers, set up to collect badly needed revenue or to protect industries that were trying to regain a foothold after the devastating effects of the war.

To get a true picture of our own present-day tariff and trade policy and its historical background, we must go back at least to the outbreak of the Spanish American War, when the Dingley tariff law of 1897 was adopted. The Dingley tariff law can be said to be the beginning of our present-day tariff and trade policy.

The Dingley tariff of 1897 was the highest in our entire history. The average tariff rate in that law was 52 percent of the ad valorem value of the goods imported—rates almost confiscatory. Those high rates of duty were levied because we needed the money,

and because tariffs provided the major part of all the Government revenue collected in that day. We had no other major source of Government revenue. The Dingley tariff was not a tariff to regulate trade; it was not even a tariff to protect American industry; it was a tariff to provide badly needed revenue.

The Dingley tariff of 1897, with its average rate of 52 percent, was the highest point ever established in our tariff walls. From that day to this we have been constantly lowering our tariff walls—except small upward flurries now and then—until today we have the lowest tariff walls in our entire history, almost the lowest tariff walls in the world, with an average tariff rate of 5.1 percent. This is a lower average tariff rate than any one of our principal trade competitors. It is a tariff rate only one-third of the average tariff rate of all our competitors, and it is only one-fifth of the average tariff rate of our chief competitor, England. We have traveled a long way—a very long way—in the last 60 years, from the position of being one of the highest tariff countries in the world to that of being one of the lowest.

The year 1913 stands out as a very important one in the history of our trade and tariff program, although we made no major change that year in our tariff laws. What we did, however, in 1913 that has had a tremendous effect upon our tariff policy was to place a graduated income tax upon both individual and corporate incomes, relying from then on upon income taxes to raise the major part of our revenue instead of relying upon revenue from tariffs. Today we collect \$56 billion in income taxes, \$10 billion in excise taxes, and one-half billion dollars in tariff revenue. That one act, the Income Tax of 1913, made possible a fundamental change in our entire trade and tariff policy. From 1913 on, our sole consideration in establishing tariffs has been regulation and protection, not revenue.

The next major step in our tariff program was the much-discussed (and cursed) Smoot-Hawley tariff law of 1930. That law established the cost-of-production principle in our tariff program, and it also made some modest rate increases. Although the Smoot-Hawley Act was passed several months after the worldwide depression came upon us, it has been blamed by many people as the principal cause for that worldwide depression. The fact is, however, the worldwide depression of the late twenties and the early thirties had many causes, most of which can be traced to the repercussions or aftermath of World War I and the readjustments to that war.

The next step in our tariff program—a step forward or backward, depending upon the point of view—was the passage in 1934 of Cordell Hull's Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. That act gave to the executive branch of the Government the tariff- and trade-making powers that the Constitution had placed in the legislative branch. Essentially, that act was an abdication of power by the Congress, a dodging of an obligation and a responsibility that constitutionally belongs to the Congress. It may be said that the act was the result of a strong-willed executive working with and upon a weak-willed, spineless Congress.

The Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act was an emergency measure, definitely described as such. It contained a 3-year limitation, and gave President Roosevelt the power to make trade agreements with other nations under certain restrictions and safeguards.

Another very important and rather serious fundamental change in our tariff and trade machinery, that was contained in the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, is the fact that the Tariff Commission was subordinated to the executive department. The Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act made the Tariff Commission the agent or servant of the executive, and divorced it entirely from

the legislative branch, whose agent it had always been.

Like most New Deal emergency measures the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act has been extended and extended, for 3-year periods, for 1-year periods, until today it is 20 years old. It has about reached its majority. The questions that face us today, therefore, as I see them, are:

1. What has the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act accomplished?

2. Should it be extended and continued?

3. Has it achieved the objectives that it was supposed to achieve; namely, establish or advance world peace, world prosperity, universal good will, amity among nations?

WHAT ABOUT WORLD PEACE?—HAS WORLD PEACE BEEN ADVANCED?

During the 20 years the Reciprocal Trade Agreement Act has been on the books we have had World War II. We have had the Korean incident. We have had the so-called Spanish civil war. We have had 7 years of war in Indochina. We have had trouble between England and Egypt, between India and Pakistan. We have had Communist Russia extending the Iron Curtain beyond her borders until she now has control and domination over 900 million people instead of the 300 million Russians she had domination over at the close of World War II.

Molotov now sits in Moscow like a big fat spider in the center of his web; he pulls a string and the flames of war break out in Korea, and we send our boys 7,000 miles away to put out the flames. He can pull a string in Indochina, Siam, India, Iran, Turkey, Greece, Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia, Berlin—all satellite nations—and the flames of war will break out in any one or more of those places, and we will then have to send our boys to put out those flames. And after 3 or 4 more years of such a program we will be exhausted, we will be bled white, and Russia will be ready to take over without having lost a man of her own. So, I ask in all sincerity: Is the world more peaceful today than it was in 1934 when we passed the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act? Has the act helped to establish or advance world peace?

WHAT ABOUT WORLD PROSPERITY?

Are we any nearer world prosperity today than we were in 1934? To try to bring about world prosperity we have given away over \$100 billion in the last 15 years—\$60 billion lend-lease during the war and \$50 billion since the war—to say nothing of the nearly \$200 billion we have spent for national defense in the cold war. Has world prosperity been advanced by the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act? Certainly our own prosperity has not been advanced, because we are in debt today to the tune of over \$300 billion, which is more than all the other nations of the world owe, all put together, and more than twice as much as all the nations of Europe owe, all put together.

WHAT ABOUT GOOD WILL, AMITY AMONG NATIONS?

Is good will or amity among nations any nearer today than it was before 1934? Let us be specific: Has the relationship between France and Germany improved since 1934? Between Pakistan and India? Between Palestine and Arabia? Between Italy and Yugoslavia—to say nothing about the conditions in the Far East?

What about internal dissensions and strife? Italy with her 36 percent Communist vote in the last election; France with 25 percent of her national legislature composed of Communist members? What about Nationalist China and Communist China? What about England, torn between her Socialist Labor Party and her Conservative Churchill Party? Has good will among men and amity among nations been advanced by the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act?

I answer by saying, "Not so that anyone can notice it."

WHAT ABOUT WORLD TRADE BARRIERS?—HAVE THEY BEEN REMOVED?

Do we have a freer flow of goods today across national borders than we had in 1934? Dr. Wilcox says, "No." Dr. Coulter says, "No." Dr. Murchison says, "No." And all the facts today in connection with world tariff and trade say, "No."

True, all tariff walls have been lowered—with the exception of Chile and the United Kingdom. Chile has raised her tariffs from an average of 38.2 percent to 46.3 percent, and the United Kingdom, our chief competitor, from 21.3 percent to 25.6 percent. All the other nations, however, have lowered their tariff walls until today world tariff walls are about half as high as they were in 1934.

But while world tariff barriers have been lowered, other obstacles or barriers more effective than tariffs have been erected in their place. Import and export licenses, currency manipulations, multiple currencies, quotas, subsidies, etc., until, as Dr. Wilcox puts it, and I repeat for emphasis: "The trade of the world today is more tightly regimented than it ever has been before in history, in time of peace."

So, in the face of these facts I ask, What is the use of lowering tariff barriers if the nations of the world erect other and more effective barriers in the place of those that have been lowered? It is a fact, and we must face it, that under the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, practically every foreign country that has lowered its tariff duties has erected other barriers against United States imports, thereby nullifying the effect of their tariff concessions or reductions.

Senator MALONE, of Nevada, one of the best informed men in the United States Senate on tariffs and trade, stated definitely and specifically in a recent speech:

"No nation has ever kept a trade agreement with this Nation. After making their trade agreements they manipulate their currencies, and we float along on a bright colored cloud and do not know what is happening to us. Ten minutes after a trade agreement is signed with us, the other nation can and usually does establish a new value for its currency, a higher value for the peso in terms of the dollar if it is a South American country, or a higher value for the pound in sterling block countries."

One of the most effective of all trade obstacles that we have to deal with today is an import license.

Under this restriction no goods of any type can enter the country in question without a specific license for the importation of a specific shipment. By merely refusing to issue a license the goods can be completely kept out of a country.

An excellent example of the way this trade obstacle works is the American motorcycle. American producers formerly enjoyed a substantial market for motorcycles in Great Britain, in Australia, and in other British areas. The British duty on motorcycles was reduced under the reciprocal trade agreements, but under the British import-license system American motorcycles have been absolutely shut out of British markets. No amount of persuasion by would-be American exporters has been able to alter this situation; so today we ship no motorcycles to England or to Australia, but they ship their motorcycles and their bicycles into our ports and have taken over a large part of our American market.

SOME GENERAL EFFECTS OF TARIFF REDUCTIONS UPON AMERICAN INDUSTRIES

The ultimate effects of the tariff reductions made under our reciprocal trade agreements program have not become fully evident as yet. It has not been possible for

the program to become fully operative because of the interruptions to world trade that have constantly taken place during the past 20 years. However, the following effects are now very much in evidence:

(a) The American jeweled-watch industry has been practically closed out as a result of our tariff reductions since 1934. We formerly had 20 jeweled-watch companies in the United States; now we have 2—the Elgin Watch Co. and the Hamilton Watch Co. Eighty-five percent of the American market for jeweled watches has been taken over by Swiss watch manufacturers.

(b) Lowered tariffs in the fresh and frozen fish industry have resulted in such large fish imports at such cheap rates that American fishermen are unable to compete. Some of our largest fish-processing plants have moved to other countries where wage rates are lower.

(c) Widespread unemployment is now prevalent in our industries that make chinaware, pottery, glassware, and kitchen articles. All industries classified as handicrafts are affected, industries that depend largely upon hand skills. This is the direct result of tariff reductions and the greatly increased imports of those articles.

(d) Thousands of lead and zinc miners are today out of work and on relief because of greatly increased imports of both lead and zinc. Recently our zinc factories have been reducing their working forces or going on a part-time basis because of the importation of processed zinc.

These are just a few samples of the direct result of our reciprocal trade-agreements program, and the results are just beginning to become evident.

In the face of these facts—and they are cold hard facts—can anyone say that our reciprocal trade-agreements program has been a success? Should the program be continued? Should the President be given the power to lower our tariffs still further?

These three questions must be met and answered—by you, by the Congress, and by the people of the whole Nation. Upon the correct answers to these questions depend the future welfare of this Nation, its economic welfare, its financial welfare; yes, its social and spiritual welfare as well.

Has the reciprocal trade-agreements program been a success? My answer is "No."

Should the program be continued? Again my answer is "No."

Should the President be given the power to lower our tariffs still further? Again my answer is an emphatic "No."

"If that be treason make the most of it."

#### PENDING ATOMIC-ENERGY LEGISLATION

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, legislation proposing important changes in the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, as amended, has been introduced in the House and Senate by the chairman and vice chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy—H. R. 8862 and S. 3323. This draft of legislation rewrites the McMahon Act which has been, up to now, the basic charter governing the atomic-energy program of the United States.

The new draft of legislation represents many hours of hard work on the part of its sponsors, other members of the joint committee, and the staff.

Though I may take issue with certain of the provisions in the bill, I know that it stems from a sincere and honest effort on the part of its sponsors to formulate legislative recommendations to the best of their ability on a subject matter that is difficult and complex.

The chairman of the joint committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE], has made it plain that he does not consider this bill the last word on the subject. In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 15, 1954, at pages 5235-5237, he stated his expectation that the bill would be revised after public and executive hearings which are to be held in May.

I urge the Members to study this bill with utmost care and to familiarize themselves with recent developments in the atomic-energy field. It is my earnest hope that the Members will not be discouraged by the formidable array of technical provisions embodied in the bill. It numbers 75 pages and contains almost 100 separate sections, some of which are carried over intact from the McMahon Act, some of which are minor modifications in the way of conforming language, while others are wholly new sections. The substance of the proposed legislation has been outlined by the chairman of the joint committee in his remarks of April 15 which I cited above.

I would not want to see, and certainly the sponsors of the bill do not expect, the Congress to be stampeded into hasty action to adopt legislation proposing basic changes in the Atomic Energy Act.

In recent weeks there has been too much glib editorializing to the effect that the Atomic Energy Act is outmoded by new atomic and hydrogen developments.

Some legislative changes are needed to facilitate the exchange of atomic information with our allies and to encourage pooled development for peaceful purposes.

It is not essential that electrical utilities and industrial companies be accorded private ownership rights in atomic energy at this time. In fact, the Atomic Energy Commission, under existing legislation, has embarked upon a comprehensive program of reactor development to promote atomic power.

President Eisenhower himself stated 2 months ago in a message to the Congress that "the act in the main is still adequate to the Nation's needs."

I favor a two-package approach to proposed changes in the atomic-energy law. Defense and peace requirements in atomic energy which involve our allies should be first on the agenda. Then the Congress should take a long, hard look at the pending proposals to confer private ownership and patent rights in the atomic field.

The Washington Post and Times Herald, in a discerning editorial in the issue of April 23, concurs substantially with my views regarding the timing and relative importance of changes in the Atomic Energy Act. I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed immediately following my remarks.

Atomic energy is now a multi-billion-dollar industry in terms of public investment. The Congress should be on guard

against an atomic giveaway through legislative loopholes which would permit selfish exploitation of atomic resources developed with public funds.

I do not mean to cast any reflection on the sponsors of the pending legislation. As I have said, the chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and other members of the committee have worked hard and conscientiously on these legislative proposals. They have made many improvements in the draft submitted by the Atomic Energy Commission.

However, I believe that the pending legislation has some serious omissions and some debatable provisions, to say the least.

For one thing, Government responsibilities in the production and distribution of atomic power are not spelled out.

The main urge to rewrite the McMahon Act comes from those who cite the potential benefits of atomic power; yet the new draft of legislation says very little about that subject.

I believe it essential that such legislation should impose upon the Atomic Energy Commission an affirmative duty to pursue atomic power developments, not only in the experimental sense, but into full-fledged operation of facilities for the production of atomic power for use in the atomic plants. There should be little objection to the Government using electrical energy produced through the use of heat which is now a lost by-product of its atomic reactors. The reactors now in existence admittedly are inefficient costwise in electrical energy production. However, new multiple purpose reactors might well reduce the present electrical energy costs by furnishing auxiliary power on a byproduct basis. The original McMahon Act provided for this contingency. It has never been utilized nor does the pending legislation provide affirmatively for such use.

In the past, the Atomic Energy Commission has tended either to sidestep atomic-power development or to lean too heavily on the private electrical utilities as the agencies who would carry the burdens—and the benefits—of this new source of electrical energy. It took action by our joint committee and by the Appropriations Committee to prod the Commission into a program of reactor development for atomic power.

Another omission in the new draft of legislation concerns legislative standards to chart the troublesome course of management-labor relations in this new industry hedged in by difficult security requirements.

Chronic discontent and frequent strife are attributes of employment in atomic occupations. The labor unions in these occupations believe they are unduly handicapped by the use of secrecy and security as a weapon of management to bludgeon their members into submission and to distort or nullify the procedures of collective bargaining. Many union representatives believe, too, that the Atomic Energy Commission has been completely oriented to the management side in labor disputes.

Whether or not legislative provisions can be written to alleviate the persistent sore spots in atomic labor-management

relations, certainly the legislation can at least provide for more effective labor representation in the councils of the Atomic Energy Commission.

The new draft of legislation proposes to grant normal patent rights in a new industry which is not normal by any standards and which is susceptible to monopolistic control by a few large corporations already possessing considerable know-how as contractors to the Government.

President Eisenhower proposed in his message to Congress, on February 17, that the new atomic-energy legislation contain a 5-year prohibition against exclusive private patent rights. I agree with the President's proposal in principle, but I am convinced that a 10-year moratorium on exclusive patents would better protect the public interest. This period of time would be required to construct the various types of reactors now approved by the Atomic Energy Commission and to accumulate the necessary operating data.

In any event, the pending legislation would allow patent rights to be exercised immediately in nonmilitary atomic activities, even before the industry has grown out of its swaddling clothes. Its adult attire, under the new bill, could very likely become a monopoly straitjacket.

I will not take time now to analyze in detail the numerous provisions of the bill. On March 1, a day of tragedy in this Chamber due to the shooting incident, I had intended to address the members on the subject of Guiding Principles in Atomic Energy Legislation. My remarks are printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of that day at pages 2437-2440. Therein are set forth what I consider to be some of the main issues and objectives in considering any changes in existing atomic energy legislation. If I can be of any help to the members in explaining further the complicated matters in this field, I stand ready at all times to do so.

Following is the editorial of the Washington Post and Times Herald of April 23:

#### NEW RULES FOR THE ATOM

New developments in atomic energy and changed world conditions make it seem timely to consider modifications of the Atomic Energy Act of 1946. The modifications recommended by the President in a message to Congress last February have now been formalized in a specific piece of proposed legislation by the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy. In view of the tremendous importance of the subject, these proposed modifications need to be studied deliberately and with great care.

The most urgent and the most unexceptionable of the suggested changes, in our view, concerns a relaxation of the McMahon Act's rigid restraints on giving classified atomic information to the allies of the United States. The new bill would make available to allies, under appropriate safeguards, information regarding the uses and effects of atomic weapons without transmitting any knowledge of the design and manufacture of such weapons. There is no breach of security in this proposal; on the contrary, it will enhance the security of the United States to have its allies understand the potentialities of atomic weapons and how to use them in the common defense. The sharing of this kind of information is indispensable to an effective alliance.

There is perhaps less urgency but equal importance to proposed provisions to facilitate formation of the international atomic pool for peaceful purposes which President Eisenhower broached before the United Nations last December. Congressional action is required to authorize United States participation in such an undertaking. It would enhance American prestige if Congress were to act affirmatively on this without delay.

The proposed grant of private ownership rights in atomic reactors and the proposed relaxation of the McMahon Act's patent provisions are, however, in quite a different category. Logically they ought to be considered separately from the first two proposals. Perhaps there will be great use someday of atomic energy for industrial power and perhaps in time the present limitations of the act will inhibit private investment and development. But that time is not yet at hand, and it would be preferable to frame legislation governing industrial use of atomic energy when the conditions of that use are more clearly evident and understood.

"It is proposed," Representative CHET HOLIFIELD declared in a warning against any atomic giveaway program, "to grant normal patent rights in a new industry which is not normal by any standard and which is susceptible to monopolistic control by a few large corporations already possessing considerable know-how as contractors to the Government." It is desirable, of course, that the industrial applications of atomic energy should be transferred eventually to private enterprise. But, as Mr. HOLIFIELD says, "atomic energy is now a multibillion-dollar industry in terms of public investment." That investment imposes on Congress an obligation to guard against any undue private enrichment through public funds.

#### DEVELOPMENT OF THE PUBLIC DOMAIN

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah. There was no objection.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a measure which, if enacted, will resolve conflicts between those who develop our public domain under the Mineral Leasing Act and those who operate under the mining laws.

The need for this legislation is vital. As exploration of our public domain increases it becomes apparent that the good of the Nation depends upon its multiple use. Under present laws, this cannot be done. The exploration for minerals and oil and gas threatens to stymie exploration for metals. Conflicts arise which hold up vital development programs.

The need for new legislation to permit adequate mineral development of the public domain has been recognized by the new administration. Assistant Secretary of Interior Felix Wormser emphasized the urgency of enacting some legislation which will open lands subject to mineral leasing laws to location for minerals subject to the mining laws.

It has not been easy to resolve the conflicts that have come into existence. That this measure has been drafted is a tribute to the fairness, the desire for cooperation, and the give-and-take attitude adopted by representatives of oil and gas interests and mining interests. Their cooperation in reaching an agree-

ment can only operate to enrich the Nation by stimulating the development of our natural resources.

Under the legislation I have introduced today, mining locations made after the enactment of the bill will be subject to a reservation to the United States of all Leasing Act minerals and right to recover them. The bill also permits the location of mining claims on lands which are valuable for minerals subject to the mineral leasing laws. Another section of the bill prescribes obligations of the parties where the same lands are being utilized for both mining operations and Leasing Act operations.

The bill establishes a procedure under which a person having an interest under mineral leasing laws may obtain a determination as to the existence of conflicting mining claims and of the validity of the claims of title to minerals disposed of by the Mineral Leasing Act. This will clear up an administrative mess by outlining a procedure to permit the resolution of contests and protests similar to procedures now used to resolve contests and protests in other public land matters.

The bill also provides a method of permitting the owner of a located mining claim to relinquish all rights to Leasing Act minerals at any time prior to issuance of patent.

The Department of the Interior seems to have interpreted the Atomic Energy Act as precluding any mining locations for fissionable source material, while on the other hand, the Atomic Energy Commission does not seem to have given the act that interpretation and has encouraged mining locations. This bill makes it clear that the Atomic Energy Act, and particularly section 5 (b) (7) thereof, does not preclude location and patenting of mining claims for fissionable source material subject to those limitations in the act as to the disposal and use of the material.

Public Law 250 was enacted last session to permit the validation of certain mining locations on lands embraced in applications, permits, or leases under the mineral leasing laws or on lands valuable for Leasing Act minerals. Many problems of title uncertainty have arisen with respect to mining claims located after December 31, 1952. This proposed bill would meet these problems.

These problems relate to mining locations made on lands affected by the mineral leasing laws and fall generally into two classifications:

(a) Locations which may have been invalid, in whole or in part, on December 31, 1952—the cutoff date under Public Law 250; for example, claims on which there may not have been an adequate discovery on or before December 31, 1952, or claims where there may have been some irregularity with respect to their location which had not been cured by that terminal date; and

(b) Locations made after December 31, 1952, some of which involved conflicts with claims located prior to that date—prior locations which may have been invalid, in whole or in part, as noted under (a) above.

Further problems have arisen as a result of the issuance by the AEC on Janu-

ary 29 of circular 7 (10 CFR 60.7) authorizing uranium leases on lands affected by the mineral leasing laws. A great many applications for leases under circular 7 have been filed. In numerous cases these cover the same lands as to which mining locations had been made, as outlined under (a) and (b).

The enactment of a bill such as the one under discussion would open to mining location vast areas affected by the mineral leasing laws. The bill would establish preference positions in order to protect mining claimants who have heretofore proceeded in good faith. Unless this were done, there would be a mad scramble to relocate such areas in an effort to capitalize on the title uncertainties inherent in the present situation. Serious conflicts, controversies and possible injustices would result.

Accordingly the bill grants: First, protection preference to any person who had located a claim prior to January 1, 1953, and who attempted to validate the claim under Public Law 250; second, subject to first, protection to any person who located a claim after December 31, 1952, and prior to February 10, 1954—the effective date of AEC's circular 7—and third, subject to first and second, a preference right to any person who, prior to the enactment of the bill, has posted notice of or filed application for or has secured a lease under AEC circular 7.

#### GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the members of the committee for the excellent job that they have done in carrying out the recommendation of President Eisenhower.

On January 18, 1954, he gave his message to the Congress in the field of health and made these remarks:

The patchwork of complex formulas and categorical grants should be simplified and improved.

He proposed a simplified formula.

The formula for allocation of funds among the States is somewhat complicated. Only today did I receive word as to the effect it will have upon the district which I represent.

I should like to present to the House information contained in a letter received by me, prepared by J. E. Springmeyer, legislative counsel for the State of Nevada, in which he states:

Financing is a key item in this matter. At the present time, each program has its own allotment formula. Under the tuberculosis control grant formula, for example, 20 percent of the funds are allotted on the basis of population and financial need, 35 percent on the basis of tuberculosis mortality, 35.7 percent on the basis of an evaluation of State program needs, and 9.3 percent in the form of a basic grant of \$7,500

to each State. Under the mental health program, 20 percent of the Federal funds are allotted on the basis of population and financial need, with 70 percent on the basis of emotional and psychiatric disorders considered to be directly proportional to the population. Thus, an effort was made under each program to give some weight to the extent of the problem associated with a specific disease.

Under the proposed allotment formulae, the special project grants would be made on an individual project basis rather than on any State-by-State allocation basis, and the extension and improvement grant would be made on the basis of population only. In the case of the support grants, however, Federal funds would be allotted among the States on the basis of the allotment formula used in the hospital survey and construction program. This formula takes into account the relative per capita income and the relative population of the various States with a greater weight being given to the financial need by a squaring of the per capita income factor. The objective of this allotment formula is to channel proportionately larger allotments of Federal funds into the States with the lower per capita income. The result of this formula is that the allotment to a very low-income State would be between several times that size of an allotment to a very high-income State with the same population.

At present, the States are required to match each \$2 in Federal funds with \$1 from State sources for the general health and 5 categorical grants. Under the provisions of H. R. 7397, the matching funds required would vary inversely with the average per capita income of the State, and would range from one-third to two-thirds of total expenditures for the proved program. Thus, the lower-income States would be required to provide one State dollar to match \$2 in Federal-grant funds as at present, while the highest-income States would provide two State dollars for every Federal-grant dollar. This will be helpful to some lower-income States which experience a large increase in their Federal allotment, but will be injurious to a State like Nevada, which has a high per capita income, but only a limited amount of funds available.

It is obvious that Nevada's health programs will suffer exceedingly when they will receive only 50 cents in Federal money for every State dollar provided by the legislature instead of the \$2 in Federal money which is received at the present time. It appears that the objective is to force the States with a high per capita income to carry a greater share of the load for good health services. But, even though per capita income in Nevada is high, it has a population of only 180,000 people, and they must bear the entire burden of the cost of government at all levels, State, country, city, and school district. The taxable resources are already strained to the limit, and the legislature may have no choice but to reduce health services in Nevada if Federal aid is reduced.

The following indicates the amount of Federal aid provided for 3 fiscal years for public health services, excluding hospital construction and Childrens' Bureau programs:

1952-53	\$105,664
1953-54	77,393
1954-55 (approximately)	79,000

Approximately \$79,000 will be available to Nevada under the provisions of H. R. 7397 (provided, Congress appropriates the \$19,460,000 as suggested), but to get it, the Nevada Legislature will have to provide \$158,000 in State money as compared to the approximately \$40,000 provided at the present time in order to obtain \$77,393.

The following indicates the amount of Federal aid provided for 3 fiscal years for

Childrens' Bureau Services—Maternal and child-health program, and crippled children's services:

1952-53:	
Maternal and child health	\$72,046
Crippled children's services	66,356
Total	138,402

1953-54:	
Maternal and child health	\$72,046
Crippled children's services	66,356
Total	138,402

1954-55:	
Maternal and child health	\$73,515
Crippled children's services	66,171
Total	139,686

Under the new act:	
Maternal and child health (approximately)	\$48,000
Crippled children's services	43,000
Total	91,000

At the present time, approximately \$95,000 of State money is necessary in order to obtain \$138,402—\$139,686 in Federal money, but under the new act, approximately \$175,000 in State money would be necessary in order to obtain the same amounts of money.

It appears that if the new formula was on a population and per capita basis it would be satisfactory, but the squaring of the per capita income percentage is the unfair factor.

Section 2 of H. R. 7397 reads in part as follows:

"Each State shall be entitled to an allotment of an amount which bears the same ratio to such sums as the product of (1) the population of the State and (2) the square of its allotment percentage (as determined under subsection (h)) bears to the sum of the corresponding products of all the States. \* \* \*

"(h) (1) The allotment percentage for any State shall be 100 percent less that percentage which bears the same ratio to 50 percent as the per capita income of such State bears to the per capita income of the continental United States."

Squaring the allotment percentage as determined by subsection (h) produces a sliding, weighted factor that results in a very heavy loss of Federal aid in Nevada, which has a high per capita income. It appears that some provision should be made in H. R. 7397 to alleviate the loss, in this State of small population that has such difficulty in finding total available funds to finance all levels of government.

It appears that the new formula is designed to unfairly increase aid to the States with a low per capita income; the benefits of Federal aid increase too greatly and too rapidly as the per capital income goes down. It should be noted that the State of Nevada is not participating in a number of Federal matching grant-in-aid programs, because the Nevada legislature has not been able to find the necessary State money for matching purposes.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, while the revised and simplified formula seems to solve the problem presented by the patchwork of complex formulas heretofore, it will in certain instances work a hardship upon certain States involved; namely, those with a small population, where there is difficulty in finding sufficient funds to finance all levels of government. I therefore am restrained to oppose the adoption of this formula until the development of a more equitable system of Federal assistance for States with small as well as large populations.

#### LIBBY DAM—PORTLAND, OREG., PUBLIC HEALTH PROGRAM

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL] is recognized for 20 minutes.

#### LIBBY DAM RECEIVES BOOST BY SECRETARIES OF THE ARMY AND INTERIOR

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I had occasion during the short Easter recess to visit my home district and to get some firsthand information on the views of my constituents as to the various problems facing our Nation. One of the domestic problems of deep concern to us in the Pacific Northwest is the development of hydroelectric power, which is one of the keystones upon which our economy depends. We are fortunate in having in the great Columbia River and its tributaries a wealth of potential hydroelectric power approximating one-half of the Nation's total hydropower, and only 12 percent of it has been developed, largely by the Federal Government on the main stem of the Columbia River. It is the consensus of opinion of all well-informed engineers and experts on the subject that at least one new start on a major hydroelectric project in the Columbia River area should be made at once if we are to meet the demand for hydroelectric power following the year 1960. Our experience is that some 400,000 to 500,000 additional kilowatts must be brought in each year to meet the increased demands for hydroelectric power. By 1960, unless a new project is started now, we will be facing a dearth of power to meet the demands of the region. It takes 6 or 7 years to complete a project after it is initiated, and the Pacific Northwest is growing in population and economy so rapidly that it is difficult to keep abreast of the demand for power, upon which the economy of our region must depend both in peace and war. With the unsettled world condition facing us, and the peace of the world being threatened, it behooves us to keep fully prepared by developing our hydroelectric potential sufficiently to make certain that electric energy will be available in the event of any emergency as well as for the success of our peacetime economy.

Recently I called together in my office a number of the Representatives of the Oregon and Washington delegations in which this whole problem of development of hydroelectric power in the Columbia River was discussed and we conferred later with Secretary of the Interior McKay and Under-Secretary Tudor on the problem urging that a new start be authorized for a hydroelectric project in this area. I am happy to report that both Secretary of the Army, Robert T. Stevens, and Secretary of the Interior, Douglas McKay, have given a boost to this proposal and to the construction of the Libby Dam on the Kootenai River in Montana a tributary to the Columbia. This is one of the outstanding projects in the area which has already been authorized and will provide flood control and navigation, generation of electricity on the site, as well as storage capacity for the firming up of power production

on the existing projects downstream on the Columbia River.

As pointed out by the joint release of the two Secretaries on April 26, the Libby project is located about 15 miles upstream from Libby, Mont. It is a multiple-purpose dam that will provide valuable flood control and power benefits for several hundred miles along the Kootenai and Columbia Rivers. It will also substantially aid flood control and navigation on the Columbia River below Pasco, Wash. Its exceptional qualities as a power project included its production initially of 600,000 kilowatts with an ultimate installation of 800,000 kilowatts. It would also "firm up" power production in the projects downstream on the Columbia River. In every respect the Libby Dam will be one of the most valuable projects on the Columbia River system and is urgently needed.

The tremendous storage of water—5,985,000 acre-feet—would provide a regulated streamflow which would add 805,000 kilowatts to the production at Grand Coulee, Chief Joseph, McNary, The Dalles and Bonneville Dams. It is the biggest storage project remaining to be built in the Pacific Northwest. At least another 90,000 kilowatts would be generated on the Kootenai River in Canada. No other proposed single dam on the Columbia River system will provide for the generation of as much salable power at site and downstream.

The original application to the International Joint Commission was submitted January 12, 1951. It was withdrawn April 8, 1953, when local problems developed. The local problems included difficulties regarding location of roads, railroads, and other facilities. To reduce these problems the Engineers have selected another site, about 4 miles upstream from the original location.

The project will cost an estimated \$263,300,000. Construction was authorized by Congress in 1950, the work to be done by the Army engineers. Planning funds of \$520,500 have been appropriated for 1954 and another \$46,000 for this work was added by the House of Representatives last month.

The dam site would be located in Montana, but would back water in the reservoir across the international boundary into Canada. The effect at the boundary and on lands in Canada would be the same as in the original application. The reservoir would extend 53 miles upstream in the United States to the border, and 42 miles further upstream into Canada, and would be  $\frac{1}{2}$  to  $1\frac{1}{2}$  miles wide. It would occupy approximately 47,800 acres of which 30,200 are in the United States, and 17,600 are in Canada. Of the gross storage capacity of 5,985,000 acre-feet, approximately 1 million acre-feet would be in Canada.

The dam would be a concrete gravity structure rising 410 feet above bedrock, and about 2,700 feet long at the crest of the dam. In addition to its great power-producing capacity, the project would provide flood control on the Kootenai and Columbia Rivers. It would also provide benefits in Canada by almost entirely

eliminating flood conditions along the Kootenai River upstream from Kootenai Lake. It is in this area where the extra 90,000 kilowatts may be produced.

Because of its international aspects, approval of the International Joint Commission is required, by a treaty between the United States and Great Britain signed January 11, 1909. It is known as the Boundary Waters Treaty.

The Libby construction is of high priority from the point of most effective and economical development of the water resources of the Columbia, but is contingent upon the working out of a satisfactory arrangement with Canada.

I most heartily concur in the recommendations of the Secretaries for clearing the way for the construction of the Libby project. I have been a supporter of this project since it was approved by the Committee on Public Works of which I am a member, and I hope that approval by the International Joint Commission may be given at an early date and funds provided to initiate the project without delay in order to meet the demands for hydroelectric power in the Pacific Northwest.

#### PORTLAND, OREG., PUBLIC HEALTH PROGRAM GETS TOP RATING

Mr. Speaker, in my recent trip to my congressional district in Oregon, I was gratified and pleased to learn that by the standards of a national magazine as used for rating 200 United States cities, Portland's public health program may be rated among the top. Portland is the center of my congressional district and our school system is an excellent one and it is most gratifying to know that Portland's public health program is entitled to top rating also.

I personally am deeply interested in public health. I was designated by the Speaker of the House on two occasions to attend the World Health Organization assemblies in Geneva, Switzerland, as a representative of the Congress of the United States, and my observations and contacts there strengthened my previous belief that the health of the nations is of utmost importance not only from the health standpoint but its economy as well.

Furthermore, our experience as a member of the World Health Organization has strengthened the beliefs of most students of this problem that world security and peace and cooperation between nations may be strengthened and furthered by cooperation between the nations on world health problems. This association has brought the nations nearer together on a worldwide problem of deep interest to all which does not involve clashes over economic problems or issues which may lead to war.

I include as part of these remarks a discussion of Portland's public health program which appeared in the Oregon Journal in its issue of April 25, 1954:

#### PUBLIC HEALTH PROGRAM HERE GETS TOP RATING

By the standards which a national magazine has used for rating 200 United States cities, Portland's public health program may be rated among the top.

In its May issue, the Woman's Home Companion rated 25 of the 200 cities good be-

cause they spend \$2 or more on public health for each person. Forty-six were rated poor because they spend less than \$1.25.

Portland was not rated. Nearest cities included in the report were Oakland and Sacramento, Calif.

Dr. Thomas L. Meador, city health officer, said the budget for Portland's health bureau is \$2.02 per capita. That puts it just inside the magazine's top class.

Dr. Meador pointed out, however, that the per capita figure alone may be misleading. Cost of the city's isolation and emergency hospitals, whose pathological functions he does not class as prevention of disease, cuts the figure to \$1.72 and puts Portland between the magazine's good and poor classification. The same condition may be true in the magazine's 25 top cities.

In discussing public health services in Portland, Dr. Meador mentioned some which make the per capita figure alone even more unreliable.

Using criteria of the American Public Health Association, the magazine listed these seven functions as the minimum which a city public health service should provide: Vital statistics, control of communicable diseases, environmental sanitation, maternal, infant, and child hygiene, laboratory services, health education, and control of chronic diseases.

"Portland has no maternal and child health program," Dr. Meador said, "but the University of Oregon Medical School here operates a complete and effective program."

While that service is available to Portlanders, it does not show up in the health bureau's per capita expenditure.

Other important public health provisions which do not show up in the bureau's budget are health education in the public schools and in civil defense, the school immunization program, and the community immunization clinic and the cancer and X-ray surveys.

Dr. Meador said that films made in mass X-rays by the Tuberculosis Association in Portland are read not just for tuberculosis but also for nontubercular chest diseases.

Multiple-purpose reading of chest X-rays is one of the things the Companion article advocates. It also urges multiple screening, already tried in several large cities and small communities. Basically, the plan is to bring as many persons as possible to a screening center for 15 to 20 minutes. During that time attendants take a brief medical history, check blood pressure, height and weight, take a chest X-ray, and urine and blood samples.

"The real problem with multiple screening is what to do once cases are found," the article admits. "You can't find cases and then leave them hanging."

#### HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COLE of Missouri). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana? There was no objection.

#### SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to address the House today for 15 minutes, following any special orders heretofore entered, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

### LIMITATIONS AND RESTRICTIONS UPON THE POWER OF CONGRESS TO TAX

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], is recognized for 15 minutes.

#### MILLIONAIRES' AMENDMENT

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, this morning before the Senate Committee on the Judiciary a hearing was commenced on Senate Joint Resolution 23 which proposes to amend the Constitution of the United States by repealing the income-tax amendment, or the 16th amendment, and insert instead the amendment as now written in the identical language but with certain limitations and restrictions upon the power of Congress to tax. The object of the amendment is to restrict the Congress in the matter of taxation to taxing incomes a maximum of 25 percent. It is known as the millionaires' amendment. Now it is proposed that in the event a three-fourths majority, or by a three-fourths vote of the Members of the House and the Senate, the amount may be raised an additional 15 percent for 1 year only.

I appeared before the committee and opposed a favorable report on the resolution. The basis of my opposition was that first it would cause our tax revenues to be reduced more than \$15 billion a year which would benefit 420,000 taxpayers only; but the burden would be placed on the poorer taxpayers, the other 42 million. In other words, take it off the wealthy taxpayers and place it on the less wealthy and the poor.

#### MINORITY RULE PROPOSED IN CONGRESS

In addition to that, the resolution contains a provision that I think is worthy of discussion at this time because it indicates a trend in this Congress to have a minority rule instead of a majority rule. The effectiveness of a democracy—and I say that we have a democracy in a republic—is the fact that a majority can always rule. In France today, they are in a deplorable situation because the country is broken up into small minority parties. They have to have all kinds of pacts and agreements between these minority parties, trade-outs, in order to have a majority to act. They have had some unfortunate experiences under that very ineffective and unsuccessful system.

The reason our system has been so effective is because we have majority rule. When we elect a President, he is elected by a majority of the people. A majority vote for him. That is the way we think it should continue to be. We want always to have a majority rule.

Under the trend in legislative thinking today, we find this powerful amendment suggested. It is embodied in this particular resolution and that is the reason I mention it; that is, to restrict the Congress, the legislative branch of the Government, to the passage of certain, particular laws only in the event that the law receives a three-fourths constitutional majority. That is not majority rule. That is minority rule. That is giving a minority control of our legislative

branch of the Government. That is wrong. We have never had that in this country and we do not want it now. But there is a trend in legislative thinking in that direction.

Since the first day of January, they have had in the other body 38 rollcall votes. An analysis of those votes will disclose that only in six cases have they had enough votes in all, voting on both sides of the proposition, to aggregate as many as three-fourths of the Members of that body. That shows how ineffective it would be if you gave a minority the power to control a legislative body. That is in this particular resolution. It is in a lot of other resolutions. I am only inviting it to your attention.

In the arguments that were made this morning before that committee, it was said that the income tax provision of our Constitution is Communistic, Socialistic, and absolutely wrong.

Karl Marx is often quoted in the arguments that are made against the income tax amendment, amendment 16 of our Constitution. I do not know about what Karl Marx said, but it has taken some of our people about 40 years, from 1913, to wake up to the fact, if it is a fact, that it is socialistic, because Karl Marx advocated a progressive or graduated income tax. I do not consider that it is.

I am not a Communist and you are not a Communist. We are not Socialists. There is not a Communist or a Socialist in this body. I do not know of any Member of the United States Congress who has even socialistic or communistic leanings. We believe in the kind of government we have today, the kind that is run and operated by a majority of the Members of these two bodies, not three-fourths or two-thirds but a majority. We have functioned mighty well.

#### FASCIST PROPOSAL

If I were to label the proponents of this amendment as they have labeled the side I represent I would without questioning the motives or good intentions of the sponsors, honestly and conscientiously say that they are sponsoring a Fascist proposal, a proposal that leads to fascism. I do not want either one. I do not want communism and I do not want fascism. I think that too few speakers in our country today in properly condemning the evils of communism too seldom mention the evils of an equally devastating enemy that is approaching from the right instead of the left, in the form of fascism. I am against both. I think we should be on the alert against both of them. One is just as bad as the other. Each leads to dictatorship, so at the top they mean exactly the same. I remember in other countries, in Italy and Germany, back in the late twenties and early thirties, that the people were taught to hate communism and socialism to the extent that they quickly and gladly embraced an equally destructive form of government in the form of fascism. They gladly accepted fascism in both of those fine countries. They had never been warned about fascism, they had only been warned about communism.

#### A DEMOCRACY IN A REPUBLIC

So I think in this country, while we are properly on the alert against any form of ideology commonly called communism, and properly so, that is approaching us from the left, we should remain equally alert against an equally devastating enemy approaching us from the right in the form of fascism. We do not want either one. We want the capitalistic form of government we have today, a democracy, a republic, properly spoken of as a democracy in a republic. That is the kind of government we want to continue to have.

I do not believe we could have that type of government if we permitted these amendments to become law, to require a three-fourths vote of the legislative body in order for a sufficient amount of taxes to be raised to provide for an adequate national defense. So I just want to humbly suggest to the Members of this body that they give this question great consideration because it is definitely a bad trend in the wrong direction.

In testifying before the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate this morning I did not have a prepared statement. When the transcript is available I expect to insert my testimony in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I am inserting herewith a copy of the resolution and a copy of the testimony of George D. Riley, for the national legislative committee of the American Federation of Labor:

#### Senate Joint Resolution 23

Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to taxes on incomes, inheritances, and gifts

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is hereby proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States:*

#### "ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. The 16th article of amendment to the Constitution of the United States is hereby repealed.

"Sec. 2. The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes on incomes, from whatever source derived, without apportionment among the several States, and without regard to any census or enumeration. The maximum top rate (a term which shall mean the aggregate of all top rates) of all taxes, duties, and excises which the Congress may lay or collect on, with respect to, or measured by, income shall not exceed 25 percent: *Provided, however,* That the Congress by a vote of three-fourths of all the Members of each House may fix such a maximum top rate in excess of 25 percent, for periods, either successive or otherwise, not exceeding 1 year each, if such rate so fixed does not exceed the lowest rate (a term which shall mean the aggregate of all lowest rates) by more than 15 percentage points. Subject to the foregoing limitations, the rates of tax applicable to the incomes of individuals may be different from the rates applicable to the incomes of corporations, which term shall include also associations, joint stock companies, and insurance companies. The determination of income subject to tax shall be by uniform rules of general application which shall not vary with the size of the income.

"Sec. 3. The Congress shall have no power to lay or collect any tax, duty, or excise with respect to the devolution or transfer of property, or any interest therein, upon or in contemplation of or intended to take effect in possession or enjoyment at or after death, or by way of gift.

"Sec. 4. Sections 1 and 2 shall take effect at midnight on the 31st day of December following the ratification of this article. Nothing contained in this article shall affect the power of the United States after said date to collect any tax on, with respect to, or measured by, income for any period ending on or prior to said 31st day of December laid in accordance with the terms of any law then in effect.

"Sec. 5. Section 3 shall take effect at midnight of the day of ratification of this article. Nothing contained in this article shall affect the power of the United States after said date to collect any tax with respect to any devolution or transfer occurring prior to the taking effect of section 3, laid in accordance with the terms of any law then in effect."

REMARKS OF GEORGE D. RILEY, MEMBER, NATIONAL LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE, AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR, ON SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 23, COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY, SENATE, APRIL 27, 1954

My name is George D. Riley, member, national legislative committee, American Federation of Labor. I am appearing in opposition to the provisions of Senate Joint Resolution 23, a proposal which would repeal the 16th amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

The American Federation of Labor has had considerable experience with this proposal in one form or another. Our federations of labor, State by State, have worked unceasingly to hold what we call the millionaires' amendment under close scrutiny and, wherever possible, under control, to the end that it would not be adopted by the legislatures.

In all modesty, it can be said that the American Federation of Labor and its affiliates and State and city central bodies have defeated, to all intents and purposes, the campaign which was waged so vigorously in the States to put across the limitation on income tax by way of the diverse method of drumming up a demand for a constitutional convention which would bring its full force upon the Congress to submit such amendment back to the States, one by one, until it should finally receive the support of the required number of States.

Through this devious method, the proponents, in effect, would almost have passed their amendment indirectly through the States before it had been submitted to them directly through the Congress.

President Meany, of the American Federation of Labor, and our annual conventions have maintained a position of consistent opposition to the millionaires' amendment. I wish to quote from President Meany's statement at a time when the vast majority of legislatures were about to convene and at the time when the forces favoring the millionaires' amendment were gathering new courage to try to put across their program. That statement calling attention of national and international unions and State federations of labor to the situation, in part, is as follows:

"During 1953, all State legislatures, except Kentucky, Louisiana, Virginia, and Mississippi, will convene in regular session. From time to time, the American Federation of Labor has kept you informed on the campaign of the Committee for Constitutional Government, the Western Taxation Council, Inc., and the various other groups which have been waging a campaign to repeal the 16th amendment to the Constitution of the United States. Repeal of the 16th amend-

ment would be designed to place a 25-percent limitation on Federal income taxes. Repeal would be brought about by forcing a constitutional convention upon the Congress of the United States through ratification by 32 States of repeal of the resolution.

"These repeal forces have met with varying success. In some States where repeal resolutions were approved, such resolutions later have been rescinded. The campaign has been in progress more than a decade.

"In recent years the American Federation of Labor and its affiliated bodies have been successful in overturning adoption of repeal resolutions in a number of States. In other States, the repeal crusade has been won in only one or the other houses of the respective legislatures.

"Defeat of this repeal process is important as a preventive to further spread of sales taxes, manufacturers' taxes, and other levies which would be bound to arise as a substitute for income taxes.

"More recently a new campaign has come about, originating in southern California, and opposed to all income taxes with or without limitation.

"Just now the advocates of repeal of income tax, either in whole or in part, are decidedly on the defensive because of the aggressive resistance set up in opposition to their long-standing campaign in behalf of the millionaires' amendment.

"I am calling attention to the present situation for your information, confident in the belief that indicated action along the respective legislative fronts in the several States, will be taken whenever and wherever possible. My opinion, nevertheless, is that the "millionaires amendment" campaigners have yet to win in many States, this, despite their claim that only 5 of the required 32-State minimum remains to assure a constitutional convention. This is because a number of States have rescinded their action in support of repeal of the 16th amendment, and further because of the relatively small number of States which still hold to their approval of the repeal measure.

"In setting up such claim, the campaigners are completely ignoring the action taken by those States which have rescinded resolutions of approval.

"The 1952 convention of the American Federation of Labor adopted resolution 23 providing, in part: "That the membership of organized labor in every State of the country must be on the alert. All local unions must maintain contact with the members of the State legislatures to induce repeal of those tax convention resolutions which already passed and to prevent new ones from being passed and; be it further

"Resolved, That the American Federation of Labor take an active part in finally defeating this proposed millionaire tax swindle."

#### HIGH TAXES AND NATIONAL SAFETY

The American Federation of Labor has held to the view that the millionaires' amendment is nothing less, or more, than a softening-up process which would lead almost directly into a national sales tax or its equivalent to fill the vacuum left by the limitation on income tax.

The A. F. of L. tax doctrine, in general, was stated again as recently as March 8, 1954, when President Meany said:

"The American Federation of Labor has consistently taken the position that high taxes should be maintained as long as necessary to meet national defense needs and to safeguard world peace. We have also stipulated that when taxes could safely be reduced, priority of consideration should be given to those in the low-income brackets."

We maintain that now is no time for anyone to avoid his rightful tax responsibility with the Nation's and the free world's safety still at stake, now on an almost hour-to-hour basis.

Had there ever been a time which might have been deemed propitious for getting this amendment across, that time passed with the coming of the Korean war. The millionaires' amendment never seemed to advance much in the States after Russia gave the march orders in North Korea. Indeed, some States which had stamped approval on the various resolutions of endorsement even rescinded such action. And action which had been pending in one or the other chamber of their legislature here and there seemed to slow down or even cease.

#### THE SECRETARY'S REMARKS

Prior to his election to the Presidency in 1952, Mr. Eisenhower was quoted as being opposed to placing a limitation on income taxation. Since that time, on July 5, 1953, the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Humphrey, appearing on the Youth Wants To Know program, was asked to express himself on taxation limitation. He replied in these words:

"Well, I think it would be a wonderful thing if all taxation were limited to 25 percent, but in view of the tremendous demand for expenditures in this Government and for the safety of our Nation, boys and girls, the problem here is not just a matter of cutting Government expense.

"That could be done if all we were talking about was just a business proposition. If it were just cutting down on waste and extravagance or cutting just business expense, that would be one thing, but that is not it. We are in a position that no country has ever been in before. We are threatened by an atomic Pearl Harbor in America which might mean the destruction of a number of our cities, which might mean the death of a great many boys and girls, men and women.

"Now, under such circumstances, it gives me great cause to say to you, you can ruthlessly make cuts in expenditures which would involve the security of our country. We ought to have that firmly in mind in determining the amount of money that has to be raised."

As I understand the Secretary's remarks, he has said that tampering with taxes in this manner is tampering with the Nation's well-being and safety. I judge he is reflecting the position of the national administration.

Mr. Eisenhower has phrased his opposition to this constitutional amendment in these words:

"I do not believe the wise approach to the problem of reducing taxation is through an amendment to the Federal Constitution. An arbitrary ceiling on the power to tax, without a like ceiling on the power to spend, could likely result in larger and larger deficits and a grave financial unsettlement. And the rigidity of a constitutional amendment would be a source of danger in possible future national emergencies.

"The position which I have taken in this campaign is that under sound and informed administration, such as I would expect the Republicans to provide next January, there can be a reduction in Federal spending and Federal taxation.

"Thus it should be possible to bring about a fairer sharing of available income tax money between the Federal and State Governments.

"In other words, a prudent and positive administration should be able to approach the goal which the Government seeks without the difficulty and dangers involved in the adoption or continuing operation of such an amendment to our Constitution."

Such representative organization as the Committee for Economic Development has taken no position in line with the purposes of Senate Joint Resolution 23. On the other hand, neither has it opposed the proposition. It may be that your committee will find that in CED the opinion is held that rates of

taxation rather than ceilings are the approach CED most favored; of course, I cannot speak for CED.

#### TREASURY STUDY ON TAXES

Because the present proposal is every bit as much a tax matter as a constitutional matter, the Joint Committee on the Economic Report and the Select Committee on Small Business set forth its findings as of February 21, 1952, in a document titled "Constitutional Limitation on Federal Income Tax and Gift Tax Rates." This issue has been active in some form for 10 years, as is made clear in the letter of transmittal covering the document in these words:

"As early as 1944, the widespread interest in the proposal led the Division of Tax Research in the Treasury Department to prepare a memorandum on the subject. At our request, the tax advisory staff of the Secretary of the Treasury has prepared current materials and analysis setting forth the implications for the Federal and State budgets, including estimated revenue losses and probable economic effects."

According to the tax advisory staff, a limitation on income tax would result in a reduction of \$16.2 billion in Federal tax revenue, including \$14 billion in corporation taxes, including excess-profits tax, which would be wiped out completely; \$3.2 billion in individual income tax; and \$120 million in estate and gift taxes.

A pertinent portion of the report makes this statement:

"The revenue loss would be difficult, if not impossible, to recover. To recover \$16 billion by a general consumption tax would require a sales tax of almost 10 percent on all retail sales, including food. To recover it through the individual income tax would require more than an increase in all bracket rates to 25 percent and a reduction in the per capita personal exemption from \$600 to \$200. Even if every existing excise tax were doubled, the revenue gained would fall about \$7 billion short of the revenue lost by the amendment."

I commend the full reading of this important report by all members of your committee. There have been some changes in the national tax situation since that time, of course, but the basic statements are as true today as they were then, in my opinion.

Where is all this going to leave opponents to the idea of raising the national debt limit? Where will it leave those who wring their hands every time they think they sense a demand for another round of wage increases? I doubt that a 10-percent sales tax will serve well to prevent demands for such wage increases.

This amendment proposal has been labeled by Dean Erwin N. Griswold, of Harvard Law School, as a "bad proposal" with a "specious attraction" because of its tax-reduction appeal. He estimates it would benefit only 450,000 of the Nation's 42 million individual income taxpayers and corporations. He adds that "no married couple with an income of less than \$20,000 would receive any benefit from this proposal."

Even Robert B. Dresser, of Providence, writing in the American Bar Association Journal, admits that the combined result of all the cuts which would be forced under Senate Joint Resolution 23 would be a "little over \$9 billion." Then he toys with the idea that a sales tax would be as high as 12 percent, not the 10 percent as the suggested possibility advanced by the tax advisory staff. He says that a manufacturers' excise tax of 10 to 12 percent would yield about that amount or a retail sales tax would yield the same amount in each case exempting food, liquor, and tobacco. And although he differs with Dean Griswold on the number who would gain relief from not paying more than a stipulated percentage in income tax, he has not offered the figure which he says would be so affected.

#### TAXES AND THE COMMIE LINE

Further, Mr. Dresser has taken up the cry heard in spots here and there in this country that income taxes, in effect, are Communist doctrine. According to this theory, all the taxes so imposed by the Congress have been in line with what the Communists want us to do. It has taken since 1913 to be told that ability to pay is communistic.

Besides those who say income taxation is communistic, there are those who, like Corinne Griffith, just don't like income taxes on the grounds that they are just so much thievery. It appears that in addressing the Advertising Club of Baltimore, she found that the invisible group running this Government has set up a plan for its ruination but she did not get around to saying who this group is. Yet, she had no alternative to the present system. She cites her authorities as Marx, Engels, the late Robert A. Taft, Herbert Hoover, James B. Conant, Bill Cunningham, and Brooks Atkinson. She went to the length of saying that income tax is the root of all our evils. This is the same evil through which we financed World War I, World War II, and the Korean war and may, possibly, finance more international unpleasantness, in addition to strengthening all nations still possessing the will to resist communism.

It is evident that this move merely to limit income tax to 25 percent is not the real motive behind this campaign. Actually, according to the prepared material distributed by the Organization to Repeal Federal Income Taxes, with headquarters in Fresno, Calif., the true objective is just what its name says it is—repeal of Federal income taxes, not only to limit such levies. Plainly, says this outfit, it does not propose any new tax laws to supplant the Federal income tax.

Frank E. Packard's<sup>1</sup> Western Tax Council, Inc., is not quite so vocal about its complete opposition to all income tax. That council prefers to talk about the brake which it says "must be put on the powers of the Federal Government to tax its citizens in times of peace." Aside from the main argument, are we living today in times of peace? If we are, I find nothing in Senate Joint Resolution 23 suggesting that its provisions apply only to times of peace.

You probably will be told of the great wave of indignation against taxation, the limits of which today are controlled by the Congress in the periodic national revenue acts. At one time, a competent scorecard was maintained in the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress showing what States had or had not acted in favor of approving resolutions supporting abolition of the 16th amendment. About that time, one State after another began rescinding resolutions of approval, to the end that it was almost on a day-to-day basis just what States had done or undone what.

#### TECHNICALITIES ON RESCISSIONS

I can assure you that much of what was undone was the result of our own interest taken in the legislatures' work in this field. We know we were responsible for many of these acts of rescission. We recognize the validity of such rescissions. Our opponents prefer to say they find some doubt of legality in such rescissions and they continue to count such States in their columns, rather than ours. If the original campaign is continued in the States, I think everyone is agreed upon one thing, the doubt will be resolved eventually in the courts.

This campaign to clamp down on income taxes has assumed something of a party line aspect. Various groups and individuals

<sup>1</sup> Resigned from Standard Oil of Indiana to become director of Western Tax Council, Inc.

have taken up the slogans in varying forms to support the campaign. For example, an organization known as Benn Hall Associates is sending material to editors and commentators remarking that Frank Chodorov's services as author, editor, and lecturer are available in New York and in Washington. Mr. Chodorov is author of *The Income Tax: Root of All Evil*. Some of the angles he discusses are: "Repeal the 16th amendment and restore independence"—"Income taxes started in Egypt 1580 B. C."—"Without the income tax, you cannot have socialism, with it you cannot avoid socialism."

I find no alternative proposed by Mr. Chodorov for all these horrible things he says beset us. Let those who know better how to finance their Government put a positive solution on the line.

The techniques used in getting some legislative-approving actions through in certain States thus far, according to a source quoted in an article in the Reporter for January 8, 1952, includes:

"Many legislators have undoubtedly voted for the resolution out of conviction that the Federal Government's power must be curtailed or that the States must get a larger share of tax money. But a good many others, it can be assumed, voted without much thought. To a State legislator in, say, Baton Rouge, it is a long road from an "aye" to an amendment that would fundamentally change the role of the United States Government. Unaware of the importance of the issue, the legislator willingly accedes to the urgings of local businessmen. . . . In every State this resolution is handed in a most undercover manner, a prominent labor leader has charged. In Kentucky it was even omitted from the daily legislative digest. . . . The technique generally used is to slip it through in the closing days, along with hundreds of other resolutions. I have never heard of public hearings being held in State legislatures on this resolution."

Just where we stand today among the States on the millionaires' amendment is almost anyone's guess. It depends upon who is keeping score. We count the States according to their original actions, not according to their original actions which later may have been changed.

As for the charge that income tax is communistic, the American Federation of Labor defers to no individual or group with our record of combating communism. Thus we give scant countenance to such basis for attempting to advance the cause of the millionaire's amendment. We pay our taxes without complaint and are willing to pay more if the defense of this Nation is the reason, as I have cited from the words of President Meany.

As a practical phase of this whole discussion, let's take another look at Senate Joint Resolution 23.

The resolution draws no line of difference between peacetime, which its sponsors say is their impelling motive.

Instead of specifying that a simple majority or two-thirds vote is sufficient in both Houses to increase the tax limit, a three-fourths<sup>2</sup> percentage is provided. And that three-fourths is not a majority of those present in both Houses but a constitutional majority.

It is hardly necessary to remark that, as in the instance of consideration of a governmental reorganization plan, it is necessary that a member merely refrain from being on the floor at the time the vote is taken to contribute to the absence of the required three-fourths of a constitutional majority.

<sup>2</sup> Only a two-thirds vote of those present is required for passage in the Senate of a constitutional amendment, according to the Parliamentarian.

We offer no suggestions to make Senate Joint Resolution 23 palatable because we oppose its principle.

We are entirely willing and ready to continue to meet our obligations to our fellow men in maintaining a complex government in a complex world.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD in 2 instances; one on What About McCarthyism?, the other is the Tax Revision Bill a Rich Man's Bill? I am asking this in order to provide ammunition for my friends on both sides of the aisle in this House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLLING.

Mr. FINO.

Mr. PELLY.

Mr. BYRD.

#### ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 4869. An act for the relief of Mrs. Bert I. Biedermann (nee Ermenegilda Vittoria Cernecca); and

H. R. 6702. An act to authorize the care and treatment at facilities of the Public Health Service of narcotic addicts committed by the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

#### BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 673. An act for the relief of Dr. Alexander D. Moruzi;

H. R. 998. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent to the State of Idaho for certain land;

H. R. 1100. An act for the relief of Peter A. Pirogov;

H. R. 1111. An act for the relief of Sister Augusta Sala and Sister Elvira Stornelli;

H. R. 1784. An act for the relief of Rito Solla;

H. R. 2018. An act for the relief of Daryl L. Roberts, Ade E. Jaskar, Terrence L. Robins, Harry Johnson, and Frank Swanda;

H. R. 2660. An act for the relief of Mrs. Juan Antonio Rivera, Mrs. Raul Valle Antelo, Mrs. Jorge Diaz Romero, Mrs. Otto Resse, and Mrs. Hugo Soria;

H. R. 3477. An act to extend to the Canal Zone Government and the Panama Canal Company provisions of the act entitled "An act to facilitate the settlement of the accounts of certain deceased civilian officers and employees of the Government," approved August 3, 1950;

H. R. 3836. An act for the relief of Petra Fumia;

H. R. 4099. An act for the relief of Lee Siu Shee;

H. R. 4236. An act for the relief of Nahi Youseff;

H. R. 5627. An act to amend Public Law 472, 81st Congress, approved April 11, 1950, entitled "An act to promote the national defense and to contribute to more effective aeronautical research by authorizing professional personnel of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics to attend accredited graduate schools for research and study";

H. R. 6020. An act for the relief of the estate of James Francis Nicholson;

H. R. 7103. An act to establish limitations on the numbers of officers who may serve in various commissioned grades in the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7402. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain real property to the city of St. Joseph, Mich.;

H. R. 8127. An act to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 347. Joint resolution giving the consent of Congress to an agreement between the State of Alabama and the State of Florida establishing a boundary between such States.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McVEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 25 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, April 28, 1954, at 11 o'clock a. m.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred, as follows:

1482. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed supplemental appropriation for the fiscal year 1955 in the amount of \$4,300 for the Judiciary (H. Doc. No. 378); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1483. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on audit of the Federal National Mortgage Association for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1953, pursuant to the Government Corporation Control Act (31 U. S. C. 841) (H. Doc. 379); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

1484. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Civil Defense Administration, transmitting a draft of legislation entitled "A bill to amend further the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1485. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting as Chairman of the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems, recommendations for proposed legislation entitled "A bill to permit investment of funds of insurance companies organized within the District of Columbia in obligations of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1486. A letter from the Acting Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report on records proposed for disposal and lists or schedules covering records proposed for disposal by certain Government agencies; to the Committee on House Administration.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar as follows:

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 516. Resolution waiving all points of order against H. R. 8873 or any provisions contained therein; without amendment (Rept. No. 1547). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 6975. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands to the Siskiyou County Union High School District, Siskiyou County, Calif.; with amendment (Rept. No. 1548). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar as follows:

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 795. A bill for the relief of Jean Hollis Vock; without amendment (Rept. No. 1546). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H. R. 8892. A bill to amend the mineral leasing laws to provide for multiple mineral development of the same tracts of the public lands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 8893. A bill to permit mining within Katmai National Monument; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BROYHILL:

H. R. 8894. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, to augment and make permanent the increases in regular annuities provided by the act of July 16, 1952, and to extend such increases to additional annuities purchased by voluntary employee contributions; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BURLESON:

H. R. 8895. A bill to amend section 2 (a) (7) of the Social Security Act to provide that in determining the need of an individual for old-age assistance under a State plan the first \$50 per month of such individual's earned income shall be disregarded; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DAWSON of Utah:

H. R. 8896. A bill to amend the mineral leasing laws to provide for multiple mineral development of the same tracts of the public lands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DEWART (by request):

H. R. 8897. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to transfer 40 acres of land in the northern Cheyenne Indian Reservation, Mont., to School District No. 6, Rosebud County, Mont.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. R. 8898. A bill to amend section 401 (e) (2) of the Civil Aeronautics Act, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MILLER of Nebraska:  
H. R. 8899. A bill to amend the act of October 31, 1949 (63 Stat. 1049); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. RADWAN:  
H. R. 8900. A bill to increase the rate of special pension payable to certain persons awarded the Medal of Honor; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin:  
H. R. 8901. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 so as to provide that feed grains acquired through price-support operations shall be sold to dairy farmers at prices equivalent to 75 percent of parity; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. VAN PELT:  
H. R. 8902. A bill to amend section 201 (c) of the Agricultural Act of 1949 (7 U. S. C., sec. 1446 (c)); to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GAMBLE:  
H. R. 8903. A bill to amend section 13 of the Interstate Commerce Act so as to preserve the jurisdiction of State regulatory commissions over local passenger fares; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PATTEN:  
H. J. Res. 505. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States limiting the tenure of office of Senators and Representatives in Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Texas:  
H. Con. Res. 226. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress on continuing the operation of a tin smelter at Texas City, Tex., and to investigate the need of a permanent domestic tin-smelting industry and the adequacy of our strategic stockpile of tin; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HARRISON of Virginia:  
H. Res. 517. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of the Selective Service System; to the Committee on Rules.

#### MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. CEDERBERG: Memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of

Michigan in the form of a house resolution No. 28 by Representatives Nakkula and Kelly urging the Michigan delegation to the Congress of the United States to support H. R. 4708 for the relief of the George Haapanen family; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FORAND: Resolution of the Rhode Island General Assembly urging the President of the United States, the Congress, the Secretary of State of the United States, and the Tariff Commission to maintain the present tariff rates on textile, jewelry, and rubber footwear imports; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolution of the Rhode Island General Assembly memorializing Congress with respect to extending the benefits of the old-age and survivors insurance provisions of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARRETT:  
H. R. 8904. A bill for the relief of Vittorio Cottone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROYHILL:  
H. R. 8905. A bill for the relief of William H. Spowers, Jr; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUSBEY:  
H. R. 8906. A bill for the relief of Maria Eva Wend; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRETELLA:  
H. R. 8907. A bill for the relief of Giovanni Navaretta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONOHUE:  
H. R. 8908. A bill for the relief of Girardi Venanzio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORANO:  
H. R. 8909. A bill for the relief of Marie-Luise H. Generali; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Texas:  
H. R. 8910. A bill for the relief of Zivojn Mitich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:  
H. R. 8911. A bill for the relief of Paul G. Abernathy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

673. By Mr. BUSH: Petition of members of Progressive Council No. 127, Daughters of America, Danville, Pa., favoring the Bricker amendment, Senate Joint Resolution 1; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

674. By Mr. GOODWIN: Resolution of the Boston City Council to Congress urging arrangements with the Federal Government to put into effect the proposal to lease the terminal facilities at the South Boston Army Base to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Armed Services.

675. Also, resolution of the Boston City Council to Congress urging the continuance of the operation of the Murphy General Hospital; to the Committee on Armed Services.

676. Also, resolution of the Boston City Council urging Congress to establish a soldiers' home at the present location of the Cushing Hospital in Framingham, Mass.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

677. By Mr. GROSS: Petition of 30 residents of Marshalltown, Iowa, favoring H. R. 1227, the Bryson bill, to prohibit the transportation in interstate commerce of alcoholic beverage advertising in newspapers, periodicals, etc., and its broadcasting over radio and television; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

678. Also, petition of 67 residents of Cedar Falls, Iowa, favoring the Bryson bill, H. R. 1227, to prohibit the transportation in interstate commerce of alcoholic beverage advertising in newspapers, periodicals, etc., and over radio and television; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

679. By Mr. MERRILL: Petition of Mrs. Martha Hoering and other citizens of Evansville, Ind., petitioning for a hearing for the Bryson bill, H. R. 1227, a bill to prohibit the transportation in interstate commerce of alcoholic beverage advertising in newspapers, periodicals, etc., and its broadcasting over radio and TV; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

#### EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

##### Foreign Exchange Students

##### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

##### HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 1954

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, the appropriation bill for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce passed the House early in this session with a \$6 million slash in funds for the educational exchange program. A Senate Appropriations Subcommittee is now considering restoration of these funds, and I wish to join with those who have earnestly and sincerely requested that the program be maintained at its present level.

In the institutions of higher learning in this country there is probably no more

culturally broadening contribution to the American undergraduate than the presence on his campus, and particularly during classroom discussion, of students from foreign countries.

I personally recall being one of a group of businessmen, at a meeting of the Seattle Chamber of Commerce a few years ago, listening to several foreign exchange students attending the University of Washington. They were students from Thailand, Korea, Japan, and various other Far Eastern countries, and each spoke briefly of his native country and of his impressions of the United States. In that one meeting a great many misconceptions were corrected and a far better understanding of our neighbors across the sea was gained.

In like manner, when we send our own sons and daughters abroad, our neighbors learn more about us.

I also recall the remarks to this body last year of the gentleman from New

York [Mr. REED], pointing out the historical contribution of the Olympic games to international understanding. It was an inspiring message.

It seems to me that the United States is hampered in its dealings with other nations because our contacts are primarily with other governments. In most cases—particularly in Asia—the government is far removed from the grass roots of the country. On the other hand, Communists concentrate on the level of the people, and try to achieve their purpose by playing on misunderstood notions, misinformation, and misconceptions about the United States, and ignorance of our customs and manners. We must, I think, do everything possible to combat such tactics in the only effective way, by putting young people who understand our country and our people in their midst.

Sending some of our intelligent young people to meet and mix with the young

people of other lands, and bringing their students to our shores, is a necessary part of the exchange of viewpoint on higher levels, as in the United Nations. And certainly at this time in history, when international distrust and fear are rampant, and when the desire for peace and good will is so strong, the opportunities for rewarding returns from such an investment urgently and eloquently argue for no curtailment of this program.

**Everybody a Winner—In Support of  
H. R. 3879 for a Federal Lottery**

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS  
OF**

**HON. PAUL A. FINO**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, April 27, 1954*

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, in the first session of this Congress I introduced a bill proposing a Federal lottery, providing that the proceeds be used for Federal hospitals, the blind, recipients of old-age assistance, and disabled veterans. Under my bill, a commission would be constituted, the members to be appointed by the President, to conduct drawings and award prizes and to pay balances not awarded, to the worthy causes I have specified. All the proceeds would be managed through a fund entrusted to the Treasury. Tickets would be printed by the Treasury and distributed and sold by the Post Office Department, thus saving costs.

There are a great many benefits to be gained by our American society in using lottery proceeds for the advantage of the community rather than letting the money Americans now gamble profit men with no scruples for the general good. Hospitals receiving Federal support would receive increases. Veterans of our wars, the unfortunate blind, and our needy elderly persons could all enjoy better care and increased benefits without the necessity of going to the taxpayer for still more funds to operate such programs on a large scale. In Mexico, these purposes are identified so closely with the popular national lottery that the council administering it is established by law within the Ministry responsible for public health and welfare.

Not only would the direct beneficiaries of my bill derive good results from the operation of the lottery but the Government would derive a considerable sum in new revenue. One of the most attractive features of this form of collection is that it is entirely voluntary. It would become a form of voluntary taxation and everybody would gain as a result—not just the winners, and not just the beneficiaries. You might ask how? Through reduced pressure to increase taxes. This pressure would be reduced because this new form of voluntarily contributed revenue would go to meet the rising expense of Government.

Historically, lotteries are as old as America. They were used to raise sup-

port for founding and improving some of our most eminent institutions. Did you know that in their early days Brown, Columbia, Dartmouth, Harvard, Rutgers, and Yale, to choose a few examples, profited from judicious alliances with Lady Luck? Lotteries were run for these colleges, and others, when help was needed to grow. A display of historical documents recently set up by the Princeton University Library contains interesting and revealing Americana that confirms these uses of the lottery.

Today, Ireland is enjoying the fruits of an honestly run and strictly policed national lottery. You know the money collected through this lottery, after the payment of prizes, expenses, and taxes, is devoted to Ireland's Hospitals Trust Fund under an act of the Irish Parliament. The fund collects over £200,000 annually; that is well over a half million dollars.

A large share of this money comes from outside Ireland; no little portion of it from American pockets. Is there any reason United States hospitals should not benefit from the expenditure of this American money? No; especially when it is considered that a great deal of money is paid for sweepstake tickets that never passes the Statue of Liberty or comes near the Emerald Isle. It's a sad fact that counterfeit tickets to foreign lotteries are widely, easily sold in this country.

We are one of the very few civilized countries that does not sponsor a national lottery. Thirty or more European and Latin American countries support welfare activities with revenues so collected. France has netted from \$15 to \$30 million in recent years from her lottery and Italy takes in over \$20 million a year. The Scandinavian countries have very successful lotteries operated under State supervision; the proceeds of which are used for various health and welfare programs. Both Norway and Sweden run multi-million-dollar programs.

These samples of the fruitfulness of national lotteries should give you an idea of what possibilities there are for this country where disposable income is so much higher than anywhere else. Why should our dollars go out to finance foreign enterprises? Estimated expenditure by Americans on foreign and domestic lotteries runs as high as \$4 to \$6 billion. Many of these lotteries have been corrupt. The Government would perform a service to the people, and gain a handsome profit for doing so, if it established an honest lottery in which citizens could take a chance without violating the law.

Opponents of the Federal lottery claim to invoke some moral law forbidding it. But there is no Christian ethic behind their claim. Why, the Bible itself tells us that lots were often cast. To take only one example from the Old Testament, there is the passage in I Chronicles 25: 8:

And they cast lots word against word, as well the small as the great, the teacher, and the scholar.

Rather a remarkable passage for Old Testament, do you not think? There-

fore, appropriate to a discussion of casting lots in our country.

Campaigns against the corruption connected with illegal gambling are a good thing. One of the aims of my own proposal is to bring into the open and thereby clean up present-day gambling on the large scale.

On the small scale, we know that churchly approval did not cease with the beginning of our era. Games of bingo, benefit raffles, and other games of chance are sponsored by our most Christian folk. Their aims are worthy, as are those intended by myself and the many other supporters of a Federal lottery. The great weakness of the anti-lottery argument is the feebleness of legislated "morality." I need not cite more than the failure of the Volstead Act to make this point.

The whole argument is based on the naive assumption that things legally prohibited cease to exist. "That the proper exercise of Christian fortitude compels us to gag at a trading stamp but swallow a bookmaker." If it was proper to employ a lottery system in drafting our young men to fight for their country, what can be the objection to a similar system for entertaining them and supporting some of the Government's services to them as veterans? There is no doubt that they, and a great section of the entire population, do consider games of chance entertaining. In a poll taken some time ago, those who expressed an opinion were 80 percent in favor of lotteries run by the Federal Government. But polls do not provide the only evidence of the popularity of chance taking. In those places where gambling is already legal, we know that the circumstances surrounding it remain cleaner and that the proceeds pay the way of a great many other activities too. Betting at racetracks has been on a rising trend for 25 years. In short, the evidence of our daily communities, our neighbors whom we respect, shows continuous proof that the great majority have no distaste for pooling small sums for the chance of winning a large one.

Assuredly those same neighbors, all of us, would gladly gratify this taste with doubled gratification in the knowledge that the system was honestly run, of service to our Government, and to benefit to less fortunate neighbors. Let us demand the establishment of a Federal lottery now. I urge your support of this legislation.

**The Predicted Recession of 1954 Headed  
Off**

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS  
OF**

**HON. NOAH M. MASON**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, April 27, 1954*

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 8300, the tax-revision bill, has already headed off the recession that our Gloomy Gusses in the other body have been talking so

much about. Following the line the CIO laid down, these Gloomy Gusses have been calling this tax-revision bill a "rich man's tax bill." However, the excellent prospects for the passage of H. R. 8300 have already accomplished three things, namely: First, encouraged investors to invest; second, inspired confidence in business leaders; third, caused industry to plan and prepare big expansion programs.

General Electric proposes to spend \$175 million this year for an expansion program; General Motors will spend \$1 billion "to meet the needs of an expanding market"; Du Pont will spend \$135 million; and Standard Oil of New Jersey has a \$500 million expansion program for 1954.

These are just a few examples of what is already taking place as a result of the improved tax climate H. R. 8300 promises for our business and industrial leaders.

Mr. Speaker, plant expansion means more jobs for the workingmen of America. When we encourage plant expansion and business expansion, the main thing we are doing is providing more jobs and bigger pay envelopes for American workers. Creating a favorable tax climate for American business and industry helps the workers of America directly, because the largest share of all factory output is paid out in wages.

Is H. R. 8300 really a rich man's bill then as the Gloomy Gus from Illinois and the Gloomy Gus from Minnesota would have us believe?

Mr. Speaker, our labor leaders, especially the leaders of the CIO, have dubbed H. R. 8300 "a rich man's tax bill" because it gives a little tax relief to stockholders on their dividend receipts, and it does not raise the \$600 tax exemption to \$700 or \$800. Now, who are the stockholders of America? Are they rich men or poor men, capitalists, or workingmen?

According to Treasury reports 80 percent of all the stockholders of America are people that earn less than \$10,000 per year. Are they the rich people that are being favored? And, according to Treasury reports, almost half of the stockholders of America are people who earn less than \$5,000 per year. Are they the rich people that are being favored?

The United States Steel Corp. has 300,000 stockholders, more than half of whom earn less than \$5,000 per year, and one-third of whom earn less than \$3,000 per year. Are these the rich people that are being favored?

The American Telephone & Telegraph Co. reports that the average holdings of its 1,300,000 stockholders amounts to exactly 27 shares. Is the average A. T. & T. stockholder a rich man or a poor workingman?

The great majority of American coupon clippers are wage earners first and coupon clippers second. Any relief given to them in H. R. 8300 is relief given to the workers of America, not to the so-called rich of America.

#### SIGNS OF THE TIMES

Mr. Speaker, the following are a few signs of the times or straws in the wind—

all indicating that the predicted recession has been headed off:

First. The Buick factory at Flint, Mich., is now working five 9-hour days per week—5 hours overtime per week.

Second. The Pontiac factory, Pontiac, Mich., is also working five 9-hour days per week—also overtime.

Third. The Cadillac factory, Detroit, Mich., is now working six 10-hour days per week, which means 20 hours overtime.

Fourth. Chrysler, Plymouth, Chevrolet, and Ford are also back on a full-time basis.

These examples of improved industrial conditions all give the lie to the Gloomy Gusses in the other body that have been predicting dark days ahead. And if these industrial examples of prosperous times are not enough, what about the price of hogs at \$31 per hundredweight, the highest price pork has been in many years.

Mr. Speaker, there are prosperous times ahead, and no prophets of gloom can or will bring about a depression.

### "M" is for Murder Mission

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. ROBERT C. BYRD

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 1954

Mr. BYRD. Mr. Speaker, the conscience of the world is shocked by the public revelation that the Soviets are using murder as an instrument of state policy. Although we are startled, we need not be surprised. Murder, mostly of the mass variety, has long been an instrument of the Soviet. I suppose the mind is better able to grasp a single planned murder, than it is able to comprehend genocide. In any event, the most recent desertion of Soviet agents, dispatched to Berlin on a murder mission, is a grim reminder of the nature of the enemy.

It is noteworthy, Mr. Speaker, that one of the 3 Soviet agents who defected to the West is a captain in the Russian secret police; the other 2 are veteran East German Communists. According to their own statements, they had been assigned to murder a man named Okolovich, a member of the anti-Soviet organization NTS in Frankfurt, West Germany.

Capt. Nikolai E. Khokhlov, 32, told authorities in the West that only a fervent plea by his wife dissuaded him from carrying out the killing. Mrs. Khokhlov remains in Moscow, together with their 21-month-old son and her 14-year-old sister.

According to Khokhlov, he and his fellow agents received special training in Moscow. He revealed that they were equipped with specially silenced electrically fired pistols and devices that fire lead pellets containing cyanide poison from a dummy cigarette case. The equipment has been turned over to the

Western police, and photographs of it have appeared in the American press.

Back in February Khokhlov and his companions slipped into West Germany from Switzerland, and Khokhlov immediately gave himself up. Then followed an interesting series of meetings until finally all three asked for protective custody. American intelligence agents, after checking the story, say they are satisfied with the accuracy of it.

With that Soviet murder assignment before us, Mr. Speaker, let us consider a Soviet kidnaping. On April 13, 1954, Dr. Alexander Trushnovich, leader of the NTS, an organization of exiled Russians, was kidnaped by hired Soviet agents. It should be noted that Dr. Trushnovich's "crime" was that he was the head of a humanitarian welfare committee. Several prior attempts had been made to kidnap or assassinate him. Before he was kidnaped on April 13 Dr. Trushnovich was brutally beaten. He was a marked man by the Soviets because he headed a Russian refugee group which assisted those who had made their way out of the prison camp that is Russia and into the freedom of the West.

Certainly the free world powers cannot stand by and allow such inhumane action by Soviet agents to pass without condemnation. Our Government and the United Nations ought to protest this kidnaping with all their strength, and their protest should be coupled with the demand that Dr. Trushnovich be returned in safety to the West.

Now to proceed just a bit further, Mr. Speaker, let us consider the case of the topflight Russian diplomat, assigned to Australia, who most recently sought political asylum in that country. He has revealed to Australian authorities valuable details on the Soviet espionage rings working in that continent and elsewhere.

These recent developments strongly indicate that there is plenty of trouble behind the Iron Curtain. It is only too apparent to those who wish to evaluate these events that, since the liquidation of Beria, there is a serious break in the ranks of the Soviet spy corps. From these surface cases, we can assume that intrigue is seething inside Russia and in several captive states. We are also well justified in the assumption that conditions behind the Iron Curtain must be intolerable when men of the rank of recent defectors are making the final break. These men are risking their lives in coming over to the West, and their dear ones, left behind in Russia, are now in jeopardy. Imagine what a turmoil their consciences must be in when they had to make a decision to risk all to be free of the dread mission of murder.

After this brief review, I want to pose several questions: Are our intelligence people making the best possible evaluation of all this evidence of Soviet defection? Are these evaluations being translated into top official United States policy? Are we closely comparing notes in these matters with top intelligence people and policymakers of friendly allied governments? I am just wondering, Mr. Speaker, wondering out loud, because I, for one, do not think that it makes much sense when we have evidence of

such internal difficulties inside the Russian orbit for us to be easing trade restrictions which have the effect of taking the Kremlin off the hook. If we are making the most and the best use of all this evidence of Russian defections, then we will not tolerate even serious discussion of armistice by partition in Indochina. How are we playing all this on the Voice of America? Are the anti-Communist millions of the Soviet satellite states being told all these things from the outside?

Mr. Speaker, these are important days, eventful days. May God grant us the wisdom and the courage to make the most of the opportunities presented to us.

### What About McCarthyism?

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. NOAH M. MASON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 1954

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, in view of the McCarthy-Army trial that is now being held, and in view of the attacks and insinuations that are being aimed at the Senator by left-wing commentators and columnists, perhaps the following sentiments will not come amiss. They express my own feelings in connection with Senator McCARTHY and his work.

Mr. Speaker, I have been asked many times, "What about Senator McCARTHY?"

I have always answered about as follows: "Senator McCARTHY is a great American. He has done more to uncover, expose, and get rid of Communists in our Government departments than any other one man in America. Joe's batting average is extremely high, about 95 percent efficient."

Many unthinking people say, "Oh, I approve Senator McCARTHY's objectives, but I do not approve his methods."

The answer to that criticism is: "If you are fighting in the ring, under well-established rules, with a referee to see that the rules are obeyed, then you fight according to the rules. But if you are fighting a bunch of gangsters and hope to get results, you follow no rules; you wear no kid gloves; you wear 'brass knuckles' if you have them; you swing a club if you can get hold of one. It is a fight with no holds barred—any method to achieve victory."

Senator McCARTHY has tackled the worst and most dangerous gang of cutthroats in the country, a gang out to destroy our American heritage, our liberty, our religion. Any American citizen who hides behind the fifth amendment and refuses to answer "Yes" or "No" when asked if he is, or ever has been, a Communist, is not entitled to "kid glove" treatment. If you look at the record you will find that many "pinkos" given clearance by loyalty boards under Roosevelt and Truman—not once but several times—have been proved to be "subversive" by the McCarthy committee.

#### IS SENATOR McCARTHY POPULAR?

Mr. Speaker, left-wing newswriters and commentators have made a great hullabaloo over the supposed mistakes of the Senator. The enormous service that Joe has rendered the American people is entirely ignored by our so-called liberals and socialists.

Senator McCARTHY has 10 times as many invitations to speak as any other Member of the United States Senate. Len Hall, national chairman of the Republican Party, has booked Senator McCARTHY solid for the 3 months preceding the fall election, and most of those speaking engagements are placed in doubtful Republican congressional districts. That is how popular Joe is with the American people. It also indicates how valuable an asset the National Republican Committee believes Senator McCARTHY is to the party—in spite of the words of criticism Len Hall has uttered for public consumption.

By and large our American people are sound and sensible. Instinctively they know whom to trust and whom not to trust. The great majority of Americans today, Democrats and Republicans alike, believe in and swear by Senator McCARTHY—in spite of the howls emanating from the Daily Worker, the left-wingers, and their dupes who stupidly follow the Communist Party line.

#### WE ARE AT WAR!

Mr. Speaker, there is a war going on, a war between communism and Christianity, a war between communism and capitalism, a war between individual liberty on the one hand and dictatorship of the state on the other. It is a war to the death. We need more Patrick Henry's and Joe McCARTHY's if we are to win this war and survive.

### H. R. 7200

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 1954

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I feel impelled to call attention to a serious blow to the public assistance part of our social-security system as proposed in the Eisenhower administration's bill, H. R. 7200.

Our social-security system established under the administration of President Roosevelt, nurtured through a series of Democratic Congresses and advanced further under President Truman, constitutes an invaluable asset to American society. Yet the Eisenhower administration, in seeking to experiment with this system, appears ready to disorganize, reduce, and confuse the public assistance half of social security.

While I possess neither the resources nor the expert knowledge in the field of social security to undertake an exhaustive study, a careful analysis of H. R.

7200 reveals clearly its inherent dangers and raises a series of serious questions impugning the entire validity of its approach.

Ostensibly a reform of public assistance to help the poorer States of this Nation, ostensibly a bill to advance a progressive, dynamic program, H. R. 7200 appears to fall woefully short of both objectives. Worse still, in a number of cases it apparently accomplishes the opposite of what it purports to do.

In general, the following conclusions may be drawn from a study of the Eisenhower administration's proposed public assistance program: First, it endangers seriously the security of old people and dependent children in States which are least able to provide for their needs; second, it undermines the ability of some of the poorer States to provide public assistance to the aged and dependent children and it requires of these States an even greater fiscal outlay for such programs to retain them at their present levels.

A brief description and analysis of the provisions of H. R. 7200 reveals their intent and how they would operate. H. R. 7200 purports to extend the current Federal matching formula for public assistance to April 1, 1955, at which time the following formula would become operative:

First. A variable matching formula based on each State's per capita income.

Second. This formula includes a factor reducing each State's Federal share by 1 percentage point for each 5 percent of the State's old-age population—those 65 years of age and over—receiving old-age and survivors benefits.

Third. A bridge to insure that no State, purely as a result of this formula, loses more than 12 percent of Federal funds it receives for any program in the fiscal year 1954. To safeguard against sudden loss of funds from the Federal Government, this formula would be in effect during the first 2¼ years of operation of the new law, assuming the State spent as much from State and local funds as it did during the base period.

Fourth. States would receive Federal financial grants on the basis of an average maximum payment to its recipients. At present the matchable amount has to be computed on each individual case.

Let us now analyze these provisions, employing figures supplied by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; data, incidentally, which the Department seemed quite reluctant to make available.

A fundamental theory incorporated in the bill is that of variable grants. The objective of such a formula is to equalize payments among the States by making it possible for States with limited financial resources to increase their assistance payments. To quote from the Department's release explaining this bill:

Under the variable matching formula, the Federal Government would give more aid, proportionately, to States where State and local resources are limited (PA No. 1).

The principle of variable grants is valid and meritorious, but this Republican bill is a defective instrument for carrying it out; the bill is inconsistent and contra-

dictory and would work great hardship upon needy people and many States.

An examination of the operation of this formula as embodied in H. R. 7200, using the Department's data, reveals that, first, some States with greater financial resources would be more favorably affected than certain States whose financial resources are limited; second, a total of 12 of the 29 States with per capita incomes below the national per capita average income—and that is the base index used for determining Federal contributions—will suffer a reduction in Federal contributions for old-age assistance; third, all but 1 of the States above the national per capita income will also suffer a decrease in Federal contributions for OAA; fourth, a total of 12 of the 29 States with lower per capita incomes than the national average will lose Federal contributions for aid to dependent children. In addition, 1 State, Arkansas, ranking 47th or next to the poorest State in the United States in per capita income, receives no increase whatsoever in Federal funds for aid for dependent children; fifth, at the same time, 11 of the 19 States with per capita incomes greater than the national average will receive additional Federal contributions for aid to dependent children.

States losing in Federal contributions to old-age assistance although below the national average per capita income are: Alabama, Colorado, Florida, Missouri, Maine, North Carolina, South Carolina, South Dakota, Vermont, Texas, West Virginia, and Virginia. Those losing Federal contributions for aid to dependent children whose incomes are below the national average per capita income are: Arizona, Alabama, Florida, Louisiana, Missouri, New Mexico, North Carolina, South Carolina, Texas, Tennessee, Vermont, and Virginia. Arkansas receives no increase, although it is second from the bottom of States below the national per capita income.

States with superior per capita incomes which lose are: for old-age assistance—California, Connecticut, Delaware, Indiana, Illinois, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Montana, Nevada, New Jersey, New York, Ohio, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Washington, Wyoming, and also the District of Columbia. Wisconsin, a State with a superior per capita income, gains. Those States losing in aid to dependent children are: California, Connecticut, Delaware, Indiana, Maryland, New York, Ohio, and Washington. Nevada gains nothing, while 10 States, plus the District of Columbia, would receive increased Federal contributions.

A total of 30 States plus the District of Columbia would lose Federal contributions for OAA; 20 States lose for aid for dependent children.

H. R. 7200 proposes a cushion period which ends in 1957. But, as has been pointed out to me by the Honorable Phil M. Donnelly, Governor of Missouri, at the time the provision expires the reduction in Federal funds will be even more drastic in Missouri and other States than during the first year's operation of this bill. Missouri, while ranking ninth in the United States in the

number of people 65 years of age and older, is third in the country in old-age assistance recipients. According to the latest statistics, Missouri ranks sixth in the Nation in the amount expended per inhabitant for old-age assistance in 1952-53. Nevertheless, it is a strange anomaly that if this bill went into effect, on the basis of figures supplied by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Missouri would suffer a 10.5-percent drop in Federal contributions for all its public-assistance programs. It would lose over \$6 million for old-age assistance and over \$1 million in aid for dependent children. After the bridge provision expires, Missouri could be expected to lose even more; the same would apply to a number of the States. States that will lose Federal contributions for these programs will either be forced to increase taxes in order to continue old-age assistance or aid for dependent children at their present levels or to reduce all assistance grants to needy old people and children in order to stay within available funds.

Still another feature of this bill places a difficult burden upon the States. Under H. R. 7200 the new matching formula would go into effect on April 1, 1955. Yet the fiscal year of most States starts in July, which means that there is little or no coordination between the two. Of course, if the purpose is to save Federal funds in the 3-month period between April and July, this is accomplished by this formula, but, of course, at the expense of burdening the States. It should also be noted that most State legislatures meet in January; they will have to act very quickly—to be prepared for the changeover by April 1. State legislatures are simply not given sufficient time; they cannot adjust that quickly.

One asset, and almost the only one in the bill, is its employment of an average rather than individual maximums in determining the Federal share of public-assistance payments. This simplifies administration, reduces redtape and administrative expense.

Nevertheless, one virtue, a minor one at that, in H. R. 7200, fails to qualify a bill as responsible legislation when it is otherwise totally inadequate. This bill is unfair and discriminatory in that it penalizes many poorer States instead of assisting them. Its effect, in many cases, would be the exact opposite of its announced purpose. Rather than a progressive advance, it constitutes a backward step in social security. Yes, it saves some money for the Federal Government, but at the expense of the meager benefits received by many of our needy aged citizens and at the expense of our State governments. Is this the way to accomplish that purpose?

Congress cannot afford to pass legislation in a vacuum. Many States suffer from economic recession; tax revenues tend to decline in such cases and old people in the labor force generally suffer first in a period of economic trouble. This bill would reduce the small incomes of many of our citizens, aged men and women who spend their entire assistance benefits for consumer goods.

They save virtually nothing from assistance payments—all goes into food, rent, clothing, medical care, and so forth—direct and immediate consumer spending. Moreover, States with the least resources as well as those with the greatest resources lose Federal contributions. The poorer States can least afford such a loss. Obviously, the timing of this bill is very poor and the implementation of its general philosophy is highly inadequate.

Is this what the Eisenhower Republican administration proposes to take food out of the mouths of our needy aged and our dependent children? Why are we not working rather to distribute more surplus food to them instead of less? We have the surplus food. Is it the Republican purpose to place difficulties in the path of State efforts to deal with public assistance? I am sure that Congress, at least, has no such purpose in mind. Nor should we adopt legislation that is so contradictory or discriminatory as to violate the basic theory upon which the legislation is allegedly premised. Certainly we can expect a better performance from the Republican leadership. Or can we? Once again the Republicans have taken an operating program, public assistance, and a good democratic proposal, variable grants, and have Republicanized it into a niggardly, inadequate, reactionary program, detrimental to the welfare of our people.

Far from criticizing negatively, I should like to call the attention of my colleagues to possible alternatives which should be considered. First of all, instead of considering legislation like H. R. 7200, we could adopt legislation immediately authorizing a food allotment plan for the aged and for dependent children. Secondly, we would continue the present matching formula undisturbed. This means extending beyond this year the McFarland amendment to the Social Security Act; Senators HUMPHREY, HILL, and SPARKMAN have already introduced such legislation. If our purpose is to dovetail old-age assistance into our expanding old-age and survivors insurance program, the present system and formula seem to be working well. For example, since the 1950 social-security amendments, which greatly liberalized benefits and expanded coverage, were adopted, the number of old-age assistance beneficiaries has been declining gradually but steadily; from July 1950 to July 1951—a decline of 55,000; from July 1951 to July 1953—a decline of 80,000; from July 1952 to July 1953—a decline of approximately 60,000. Consequently, if we retain the existing formula, the old-age assistance load will gradually shift to old-age and survivors insurance. And in this process, the States will not be handicapped or driven to reducing average benefits. The transition will prove easy for them; they will find sufficient time to adjust to the change; and the aged people, themselves, will not suffer.

If we wish to increase the speed of transfer from old-age assistance to old-age and survivors insurance, it will be necessary to adopt a really liberal old-age and survivors insurance act. The Eisenhower proposals in H. R. 7199,

which contemplate an increase in minimum old-age and survivors insurance primary benefits of \$5 a month, will not serve this purpose. On the other hand, a bill for comprehensive expansion and liberalization of social security such as H. R. 6035, which I have introduced, and

which is identical with similar bills introduced by other Democrats, constitutes a step in the right direction.

Nevertheless, whatever action we take in the House, let us beware of H. R. 7200. Let us remember that those unfortunates, the needy aged, the dependent

children, the blind and the disabled, are human beings as deserving in consideration and justice as the rest of us. Let us assist rather than burden the States in their endeavors to help such people. Let us guard and strengthen our social-security system.

## SENATE

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 28, 1954

(Legislative day of Wednesday, April 14, 1954)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Lord God Almighty, judge of men and of nations, Who amidst the shifting sands of time standeth sure: Like men who turn from the dust of the desert to crystal streams, so we lift our soiled faces to Thee from the perplexities and the imperfections which crowd the common days. As we pause in reverent silence let this high place of a people's hope, so great a factor in tomorrow's pattern for all men, become the audience chamber of Thy presence. Because there is no solution of the world's ills save as it springs from individual hearts, we pray for ourselves. Give us a solemnizing sense of our fallibility. Cleanse Thou our hearts by Thy grace. Feed our minds with Thy truth. Guide our feet in the way of Thy will, and lead us in the paths of righteousness. For Thy name's sake. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. KNOWLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, April 27, 1954, was dispensed with.

### MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting a nomination was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 7397) to amend the Public Health Service Act to promote and assist in the extension and improvement of public health services, to provide for a more effective use of available Federal funds, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

### ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 364. An act for the relief of the Advance Seed Co., of Phoenix, Ariz.;

S. 893. An act for the relief of David T. Wright; and

S. 2247. An act to authorize certain members of the Armed Forces to accept and wear decorations of certain foreign nations.

### COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. CAPEHART, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Banking and Currency was authorized to meet this afternoon during the session of the Senate.

### ORDER FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that immediately following the quorum call there may be the customary morning hour for the transaction of routine business, under the usual 2-minute limitation on speeches.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following communication and letter, which were referred as indicated:

PROPOSED SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION, DEPARTMENT OF LABOR (S. Doc. No. 118)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed supplemental appropriation, in the amount of \$18,900,000, for the Department of Labor, fiscal year 1954 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

MEDICAL CARE FOR DEPENDENTS OF MEMBERS OF ARMED FORCES

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide medical care for dependents of members of the Armed Forces of the United States, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

### MEMORIALS

Memorials were laid before the Senate, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:  
A telegram in the nature of a memorial from the Indiana Federation of Clubs, French Lick, Ind., signed by Mrs. George L.

Miller, corresponding secretary, embodying a resolution adopted by that organization, protesting against the admission of Red China into the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the Las Juntas Parlor, No. 221, Native Daughters of the Golden West, Martinez, Calif., protesting against the admission of Red China into the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

### SAFEGUARDING THE RIGHTS OF CERTAIN LANDOWNERS IN WISCONSIN—RESOLUTION OF IRON COUNTY (WIS.) BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have received a resolution from the Iron County Board of Supervisors on behalf of H. R. 8006, to safeguard the rights of certain landowners in Wisconsin whose title to property has been brought into question by reason of errors in the original survey and grant.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed at this point in the RECORD and be thereafter appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the legal effect of United States Government resurveys of lands claimed by the Government to have been omitted from the original Government survey is presently open to question and dispute; and

Whereas H. R. 8006 has been introduced in the Congress of the United States by our Congressman, ALVIN E. O'KONSKI, which, if enacted, will correct said situation and define the extent of effect of said Government resurveys: Be it

Resolved by the Iron County Board of Supervisors of Iron County, Wis., duly assembled this 20th day of April 1954, That we, the said board of supervisors, endorse H. R. 8006, and recommend the passage thereof as introduced; be it further

Resolved, That we hereby commend the Honorable ALVIN E. O'KONSKI, Representative in Congress from the 10th Congressional District of Wisconsin, for introducing said legislation, and urge our said Congressman and our United States Senators, the Honorable ALEXANDER A. WILEY and the Honorable JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY, to support said legislation; be it further

Resolved, That the county clerk of Iron County be, and he is hereby, instructed to forward to the Honorable ALVIN E. O'KONSKI, the Honorable ALEXANDER A. WILEY, and the Honorable JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY a certified copy of this resolution to each.

### OUTLAWING OF COMMUNIST PARTY—LETTER

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on April 22, I referred to the much-debated issue of whether or not the Communist Party should be outlawed.